

833. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging increase of subsistence allowances for war veterans while pursuing educational courses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

834. Also memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of unemployment insurance for the maritime service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

835. By Mr. SHEPPARD: Memorial of the Senate of the Legislature of California relative to memorializing the officers and agencies of the Federal Government to take immediate action for the conversion of the Kaiser steel plant at Fontana, Calif., to a peacetime industry; to the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.

836. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution 19 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to maintain the existing gold reserve ratios and to enact legislation to increase the monetary value of gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

837. Also memorial of the Senate of the Legislature of California, relative to memorializing the officers and agencies of the Federal Government to take immediate action for the conversion of the Kaiser steel plant at Fontana, Calif., to a peacetime industry; to the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.

838. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Leavenworth, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the formation of a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1945

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 31, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose throne is truth, frail creatures of dust, serving out our brief day on the world's vast stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity and feel Thy greatness and Thy peace. Though other helpers fail and comforts flee and bitter loss darkens our path, let the noontide of Thy grace and love remain, for—

"We fear no foe, with Thee at hand to bless;

Ills have no weight, and tears no bitterness."

And now, seeing in the fair and firm fabric of the Nation's life that we are compassed about by so great a cloud of witnesses to the reality and glory of God, steady our hands as to us is handed on the torch of righteousness with a new commission in this Thy glorious day, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2502. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on fourth-class mail matter, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

### NOTICE OF MEETING OF CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, as vice president of the Congressional War Parents' Association, I want to notify the Senators and Members of Congress, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of a meeting of the Congressional War Parents' Association to be held on Wednesday, June 6, at 4 in the afternoon.

The meeting will be held in the Appropriations Committee room of the House of Representatives. We would appreciate as good attendance of Senators as possible.

### NOTICE OF ADDRESS ON CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Commission appointed by President Truman to visit the Philippine Islands has returned to Washington. Some time today I hope to have a chance to talk with the President about it, but on Thursday when the Senate convenes, or as soon after it convenes as I may obtain the floor, I should like to tell the Senate what we saw, what the conditions are, and, in a general way, what our recommendations are in reference to the Philippines, past, present, and future. I hope Senators may find it possible to be present, because it is very difficult to get an understanding of the Philippines without going there, and therefore I have brought back many photographs and other pertinent data, which I am hopeful will be helpful in assisting us to find a solution to the problems of the Philippines insofar as they are related to our own. Therefore, next Thursday, as soon after the Senate meets as possible, I shall try to tell those who may do me the honor to be present what we encountered on our mission, some of the things that have been going on in the Philippines, prospects for the future, and some solutions which we respectfully but humbly suggest as applicable to the present situation.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Sena-

tor from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] be excused from attendance in the Senate during the present week on account of important public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted the senior Senator from North Carolina.

### CHRISTENING AND COMMISSIONING OF AIRCRAFT CARRIER "LAKE CHAMPLAIN"—CAPTAIN RAMSEY'S MESSAGE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on yesterday in a double ceremony conducted at the Norfolk Navy Yard at Portsmouth, Va., the aircraft carrier *Lake Champlain* was made a living unit of the greatest fleet the world has ever seen. I observed while visiting the navy yard for 2 days the remarkable achievements that are now going forward under the very expert and highly qualified leadership of Rear Admiral C. H. Jones and an excellent—I would say superior—staff of experts. I took some pains to notice the personnel, the manpower, the masters, the manner in which the business of that great yard was being conducted, and I wish to testify from personal observation that I think it is one of the most magnificent operations I have ever seen, and I believe it to be one of the finest operations of this character that our Navy has ever undertaken. This great ship, the *Lake Champlain*, is a further evidence of the efficiency of the officers, masters, and the men who have been building up a large part of the Navy of the United States at the Norfolk Navy Yard.

In the course of this dual ceremony involving both the christening and commissioning of the vessel, which was the first one of its kind that has ever occurred in the case of a ship of this size, an address was delivered by Capt. Logan Ramsey, who commands this ship. Although brief, this was a very inspiring address, and the full complement of the ship was there on the flight deck to receive his message. There was also a large audience seated on this vast plane carrier. To show how simple and direct it was, I want to say that my grandson, of the age of 14, sitting beside me, leaned over at the end of the speech and said, "Even Ned and I understand that." I think that the address delivered by Captain Ramsey is of such stimulating value that I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Officers and men of *Lake Champlain*, you and I have become members of the ship's company assigned to this aircraft carrier of the *Essex* class. All of our sister ships have the same size, outward appearance, and general characteristics. Yet this new carrier of ours is, in many respects, quite different from the original *Essex*. Alteration after alteration has been made in the basic design—all derived from the combat experience of the fast carrier task forces. Our armament, both offensive and defensive, has been increased, our protection against battle damage has been strengthened, and our equipment has been improved and augmented.

Conservatively speaking, our striking power is half again that originally possessed by *Essex*. We will be materially better equipped to repel hostile attacks and to resist battle damage than was U. S. S. *Franklin*. Incon-

porated into the structure of this new home of ours are the latest design improvements that the brains of America could conceive, the finest equipment that its wealth could buy, and the soundest construction its brawn could build. Therefore it is my considered opinion that, today, the finest aircraft carrier ever built is the U. S. S. *Lake Champlain*.

This ship was made possible by the purchase of War bonds by the citizens of New York. It was built by the New Construction Department of the Norfolk Navy Yard. Hundreds of companies throughout the United States have supplied material for her machinery and her equipment. But now these and all others who have contributed to the building of this vessel have finished their task. They have given this ship of ours everything it requires with one exception—life. That is our job.

In a few moments, when the watch is set, *Lake Champlain* will become a distinct entity. Its personality will be formed by the integration of our individual strengths and weaknesses. From that moment on our personal desires, hopes, and ambitions will be of secondary importance to the welfare and fighting efficiency of the ship.

Each of us has been given training in the individual duties assigned us on board. Each of us must now learn how to coordinate his efforts with those of the man at the next battle station. We must work together, live together, learn together, and think together in order that we may fight together effectively. Our teamwork must be developed to the point where no officer or man is indispensable. Regardless of who may become incapacitated, there must be a trained relief ready to step in and take over so that *Lake Champlain* may continue in action and to inflict damage on the enemy.

Yet it is incumbent upon us to realize the importance of the individual—no matter what his duty may be. Each of you has been assigned a task that definitely contributes to our general welfare and a battle station which permits him to add to the battle efficiency of the ship. Remember that—and remember it always.

When we join the fleet, *Lake Champlain* is going to be judged by a very high standard—the one set by the other fast carriers who have preceded us into action. While it will be most difficult to equal their superb performance we can, and will, succeed.

Our course is set—the task ahead clearly defined. As your commanding officer, I face the future with pride and confidence—pride in this magnificent ship of ours and confidence in you—its crew. For I feel certain that, when the last battle of the war has been fought and *Lake Champlain* hoists her homeward bound pennant, you will have earned the right to say—

"I have fought a good fight,  
I have finished my course.  
I have kept the faith."

Commander DeWolfe—Set the watch.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 201 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the executive assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, revised estimates of personnel requirements for the Bureau of the Census for the quarter ending June 30, 1945

(with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to maintain the existing gold reserve ratios and to enact legislation to increase the monetary value of gold

"Whereas the State of California is the leading gold-mining State in the Union, producing over \$45,000,000 in virgin gold during the last year of unrestricted operation before the war, with many of its communities existing because, and dependent upon, this industry; and

"Whereas any congressional action in regard to gold reserve ratios or gold valuation is of vital and special interest to California, particularly when cost of labor, materials, and equipment makes gold mining less profitable; and

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress S. 510, by Senator WAGNER, to reduce the gold reserve ratios provided by the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, in order that currency may be expanded; and

"Whereas as an alternative to such action, Representative ENGLE has introduced H. R. 2343 and Senators McFARLAND and SCRUGHAM have introduced S. 649, to continue existing gold reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits, by increasing the monetary value of gold; and

"Whereas by the latter proposal the dollar value of gold will be increased in precisely the same proportion and permit issuance of the same amount of currency as would be possible by reducing the reserve requirement, but without the inflationary dangers presented by the Wagner plan, and will at the same time benefit the gold-mining industry and do no harm in the international field: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature hereby expresses its opposition to S. 510 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and its approval of H. R. 2343 and S. 649 of said Congress, and hereby respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to so act that the purpose sought to be achieved by H. R. 2343 and S. 649 may be effected; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Reserve Board."

A resolution adopted by the Oswego Advisory Committee, Fort Ontario Shelter, Oswego, N. Y., relating to the care of European war refugees at Fort Ontario Shelter, Oswego, N. Y.; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Federal income-tax law so that it will not discriminate against 40 States including Oklahoma, in favor of the 8 States having community property laws

"Whereas the Federal income-tax laws for years have made a discrimination in favor of

the 8 community property States and against 40 States including Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in 1937 pointed out that the loss of revenue to the Federal Government due to this unjustifiable discrimination against the residents of 40 States amounts to millions of dollars; and

"Whereas said discrimination in favor of the residents of community property States has become increasingly sharp as Federal surtax rates have increased, and is now grossly unfair to Oklahoma and the other 39 States similarly situated; and

"Whereas due to this discrimination in the Federal income-tax law the State of Oklahoma may lose many of its residents to the State of Texas where they may cause one-half of their incomes to be reported by their wives and thus avoid paying the higher income taxes they would have to pay on the same income if they remained in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas it is evident that the Federal income-tax law should be amended to set aside this unjust and unreasonable discrimination and to provide that Federal income taxes shall be collected on the same basis, and in the same amount regardless of whether such income is earned by a resident of one of the 8 community property States or by a resident of one of the 40 States not having the community property system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to amend the Federal income-tax law so that it will not discriminate against the 40 States of the Union not having the community property system in favor of the 8 States having community property laws, but will provide that Federal income taxes shall be collected on the same basis and in the same amount regardless of whether such income is earned by a resident of 1 of the 8 community property States or by a resident of 1 of the 40 States not having the community-property system.

"Sec. 2. That the Members of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to diligently endeavor to have the Congress of the United States of America amend the Federal income-tax law as herein requested.

"Sec. 3. That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each House of the Congress of the United States of America, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to speedily enact legislation to create an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of considering, adjusting, and settling Indian claims against the Government

"Whereas for many years Indian tribal claims involving millions upon millions of dollars have been prosecuted against the United States Government without satisfactory results to either the Government or to the Indians, and until these claims are settled or adjusted they will continue to be prosecuted at an enormous expense to both the Government and the Indian tribes; and

"Whereas the administration of Indian affairs in the United States is being continually hamstrung because of these pending claims, which involve the broad proposition of Government guardianship over its Indian wards, and not until said claims have been



settled or adjusted may it be reasonably expected that this obstacle will be leveled; and

"Whereas the basis of these claims emanate from solemn treaties entered into between the United States and many of the Indian tribes, and at this time when our Nation is fighting to maintain national and international integrity, it is well to lay a proper predicate at home for carrying out solemn obligations in order that the example might well be followed all over the world; and

"Whereas the two major political parties in their respective platforms in 1940 advocated and recommended that some effective legislation be enacted for the purpose of settling and disposing of Indian claims. The Democratic platform providing as follows:

"We favor and pledge the enactment of legislation creating an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of entertaining and investigating claims presented by Indian groups, bands, and tribes, in order that our Indian citizens may have their claims against the Government considered, adjusted, and finally settled at the earliest possible date."

"And the Republican platform provided as follows:

"We pledge an immediate and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation; and

"Whereas the passage of such proposed legislation will keep faith with such pledges; and

"Whereas the present procedure for handling Indian claims is inadequate, expensive, and unsatisfactory, and in all likelihood the Court of Claims will be overburdened and cluttered with claims arising out of the present war; and

"Whereas the Honorable W. G. STIGLER, Congressman from the Second District of Oklahoma, has introduced in the House of Representatives House bill 1198, the provisions of which are in keeping with the foregoing pledge of the major political parties; and

"Whereas the enactment of such a bill will provide a feasible and expeditious method

for disposing of Indian claims against the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the State Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives of the said State concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to speedily enact legislation to accomplish these purposes in keeping with the foregoing pledges; be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, and the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, and of the Senate of the United States, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior."*

#### INVESTIGATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the regular meeting of Tim Running Post No. 24, American Legion, held at Devils Lake, N. Dak., on May 7, 1945, favoring an investigation of the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention that certain charges have been made against the Veterans' Administration, charging that the Administration is entwined with red tape and so immune to new ideas in treatment and otherwise that delays, neglect, inefficiency, and callous indifference to human values have characterized its operations; and

Whereas an investigation of the Veterans' Administration is now pending, so that the truth of these charges may be determined; and

Whereas it has further been charged that the power and authority of the Veterans' Administration is too centralized in Wash-

ington so that inefficiencies and delays occur: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That we favor the thorough investigation of the Veterans' Administration, so that the truth or falsity of these charges may be determined and so that the Veterans' Administration may be made more competent to render services for the returning veterans; and be it further*

*Resolved, That we ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to aid and assist in such investigation to see that the Veterans' Administration is so constituted so as to give prompt, efficient and sympathetic consideration to the veterans of all wars, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our two Senators and Representatives in Congress.*

MAXWELL BOYD,  
Post Commander.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2031. A bill for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards; without amendment (Rept. No. 323); and

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Tucker, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 324).

#### PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of May 1945, from the acting chairman and chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May, in compliance with the terms of Sen-

ate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney.....	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW.....	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.....	\$6,400
Harold E. Merrick.....	506 Aspen St. NW.....	do.....	4,800
Thomas J. Scott.....	1210 34th St. SE.....	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.....	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen.....	1434 Saratoga Ave.....	District of Columbia government.....	3,500

KENNETH McKELLAR, Acting Chairman.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

JUNE 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May, in compliance with the terms of Sen-

ate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April.....	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.....	War Production Board, 3d and Independence Ave. SW.....	\$3,200
Groff Conklin.....	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	do.....	5,600
Philip C. Curtis.....	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Ranier, Md.....	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.....	3,800
Richard P. Daniels.....	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.....	1,440
Marion Dillon.....	3639 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.....	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.....	3,200
Ruth Fine.....	804 Houston Ave., Takoma Park, Md.....	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.....	2,000
Rose Gerber.....	2513 14th St. NE., Washington, D. C.....	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.....	2,000
Joseph McMurray.....	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.....	Department of Labor, 14th and Constitution Ave. NW.....	4,600
Carl Malmberg.....	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.....	5,600
Love Morgan.....	1007 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.....	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and 1 St. NW.....	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein.....	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	do.....	2,600
Sari Schwartz.....	1701 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.....	2,000
Lt. Leslie Falk, AUS, Medical Corps.....	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C.....	U. S. Army, Pentagon Bldg.....	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, USNR.....	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.....	U. S. Navy, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.....	3,000

<sup>1</sup> On extended leave without pay.

CLAUDE PEPPER, Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,  
May 31, 1945.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
President, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.  
DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate

Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying

the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt.....	6007 34th Pl. NW, Washington, D.C.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.....	\$5,600
Ward Bowman <sup>1</sup> .....	Wilton Woods, Alexandria, Va.....	Justice Department, Washington, D. C.....	6,500
Bertram M. Gross.....	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va.....	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.....	8,600
Hilda Hamilton.....	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D.C.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.....	2,200
Doris Phippen.....	40 Plattsburgh Court NW., Washington, D. C.....	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.....	2,200

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bowman devoted approximately 50 percent of his time to the subcommittee.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of John C. May and Eva Jenkins May; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. Moore):

S. 1085. A bill to provide for payment of travel and other expenses of members of the tribal council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma;

S. 1086. A bill to prohibit the collection of fees by the Secretary of the Interior for administration of the funds of restricted Indians; and

S. 1087. A bill to amend section 27 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 159), an act making appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; to the Committee on Indian Affairs. (Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1088, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1089. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1090. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to increase the limitation on amounts of loans which may be guaranteed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under such act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1091. A bill relating to venue in prosecutions for offenses against the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1092. A bill to prohibit the appointment of persons of less than one-half Indian blood to the Office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and

S. 1093. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1094. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for retirement of individuals who are 63 years of age or over and who have completed 40 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 1095. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to increase the amounts payable under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1096. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees in the field service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### JURISDICTION OF CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for ap-

propriate reference, a bill to relieve judges of the circuit court of appeals of jurisdiction to grant writs of habeas corpus. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1088) to relieve judges of the circuit courts of appeal of jurisdiction to grant writs of habeas corpus was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subsection (a) of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1925, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In a proceeding in habeas corpus in a district court, or before a district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the circuit court of appeals of the circuit wherein the proceeding is had."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

#### EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection, as follows:

"(n) In establishing or maintaining maximum prices under this act or otherwise in the case of collect-on-delivery sales of any commodity where under established practices of the seller a uniform charge is added to the price to cover mailing costs, an increase in maximum prices shall be allowed equivalent to any increase in such costs heretofore or hereafter resulting from increased postal rates or charges."

#### HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2502. An act readjusting the rates of postage on fourth-class mail matter, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

#### INVESTIGATION OF COTTON AND OTHER PRODUCTS IN ROAD BUILDING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the use of cotton products and byproducts and synthetic rubber made from waste products in the building of roads, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 131) was received and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the use of cotton products and byproducts and synthetic rubber made from waste products in the building of roads, with a view to ascertaining (1) the extent to which such products are being used for such purposes, and (2) means by which such use may be increased during the postwar period. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations with respect to necessary legislation as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### BRETTON WOODS—ADVERTISEMENT FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "We Believe Bretton Woods Is Good Business," from the Washington



Post of May 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DUCK DAMAGE TO CROPS—ARTICLE FROM BOTTINEAU COURANT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Duck Damage to Crops Stressed in Union Resolution," from the Bottineau (N. Dak.) Courant of May 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I want to read a paragraph from a letter written by Hon. DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, with national headquarters at Akron, Ohio. The letter is dated May 31, 1945, and in it Mr. Emery says:

An effort is being made to create a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission, which would be about the worst thing that could happen to business. This bill—H. R. 2232—would set up a Federal bureau practically unlimited as to both size and authority. A comprehensive analysis of H. R. 2232 has been made by Congressman CLARK FISHER, of Texas, and I'd suggest that you ask him to send you a copy. His address is House Office Building, Washington, D. C. We are working with a number of other associations to defeat this bill.

I not only want to place before my colleagues the opinion of the National Small Business Men's Association but I want also to show how erroneous is the idea some people have sought to disseminate in the minds of the American people that the only opposition to the FEPC is southern opposition.

In further confirmation of the fact that that is not a true statement, I ask that the list of the trustees of the National Small Business Men's Association, whose president wrote this letter, the companies with which they are connected, and their location, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### TRUSTEES

W. J. Boos, Walk-Easy Foot Rest Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.

C. R. Boyd, H. C. Boyd Lumber Co., Coraopolis, Pa.

Harry E. Brinkman, Foto-Lith, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

DeWitt Emery, Monroe Letterhead Corp., Akron, Ohio.

L. M. Evans, Elliott & Evans, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

W. W. Gail, Gail-Billings Advertising Co., Billings, Mont.

Dr. Alfred P. Haake, economist, Park Ridge, Ill.

D. H. Holloway, Insurance and real estate, Akron, Ohio.

Wilbur A. Jones, Northrop-Jones Co., Omaha, Nebr.

A. F. Mathews, Consolidated Freight Co., Saginaw, Mich.

Monroe Shakespeare, Shakespeare Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Russell Stover, Stover Candy Co., Kansas City, Mo.

J. Raymond Tiffany, attorney, Hoboken, N. J.

James S. Westbrook, investments, Bridgeport, Conn.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that at a meeting of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation it was unanimously resolved that hearings on Senate bill 555, the Missouri Authority bill, will begin here in Washington on Monday, September 17.

Mr. LANGER. I did not hear the announcement. What date did the Senator mention?

Mr. OVERTON. Monday, September 17. I express the hope that all interested will be ready and prepared to be present at that time, or immediately thereafter, during the period in which the hearings will be conducted. When I have further information as to the number of witnesses who desire to appear I shall undertake to fix a definite schedule of days for the proponents and the opponents. I wish to say, however, that in view of the fact that the proponents wanted an earlier date and the opponents wanted a later date, we held a hearing upon that question, and after listening to both sides, the subcommittee was unanimously of the opinion that the hearings should not begin until September 17.

#### NATURALIZATION OF HANS WILLIAM ROHL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, former Senator Nye inserted a broadcast in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 7, 1943, Appendix, page A5315. Since that broadcast a report was submitted to the House of Representatives by Mr. MAY, of the Military Affairs Committee, on June 14, 1944, Report No. 1638, which refers to the naturalization of Hans William Rohl. A committee of the State Senate of California submitted a report on the same subject matter, which report was submitted by Senator Jack B. Tenney, of Los Angeles County, on April 16, 1945, page 1425, Journal, State Senate of California.

The report of the Committee on Military Affairs to the House of Representatives contained the official record of the proceedings before United States District Judge J. F. T. O'Connor, of Los Angeles, as follows:

Inquiry was made of the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding this alien, immediately following the filing of his petition for naturalization, with negative results.

Mr. Rohl's petition for naturalization was heard by the court on September 15, 1941, along with the petitions of other aliens. It was the practice at that time, when a case had facts to be presented to the court, to prepare a written report to the court reciting the relevant facts. Enclosed herewith is a copy of this report to the court. The facts in the case were presented to the court without objection and without recommendation. After considering the facts the court entered an order admitting Mr. Rohl to citizenship on September 15, 1941.

"83608, HANS WILHELM ROHL—PETITION FILED MARCH 10, 1941

"No objection will be made to the granting of this petition. For the information of the court, however, the results of the investigation made in connection with the case are herewith presented.

"The petition was filed on March 10, 1941, under the provisions of section 310 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, which grants certain exemptions from the usual requirements of the naturalization law to the spouse of a United States citizen and which requires proof of good character for a period of at least 1 year immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

"The petitioner was born in Germany in 1886 and has resided in the United States since 1913. From about 1916 to 1925 he lived with one Marion Henderson in the State of California, but they were not legally married, and no marriage ceremony of any kind was performed. As a result of this relationship four children were born to them. On April 22, 1925, they entered into a written agreement under the terms of which Marion Henderson was to have the use of the home property in Sacramento, Calif., and to receive \$70 per month during her lifetime or until she should marry. He was also to pay her \$45 per month for the support of each child during minority. The investigation shows that the terms of this agreement have been fulfilled by the petitioner. He married his present wife, who is a citizen of the United States, on August 26, 1925, and has resided with her continuously since then.

"There is some evidence to indicate that the petitioner has represented himself as a United States citizen. The petitioner has stated, however, that he has never believed himself to be a citizen and has never willfully represented himself as a citizen of the United States.

"In 1932 the petitioner made 10 or 12 trips to Mexico in connection with a contract which he had to build roads there and on these trips left and reentered the United States at Laredo, Tex. The Immigration Service has reported that it has no record of his inspection upon his returns from these absences. The petitioner states that he was never questioned as to his citizenship but was only asked where he lived and was permitted to reenter the United States.

"On September 3, 1933, the petitioner arrived at San Diego, Calif., on the yacht *Ramona*, which was registered in the name of his wife, on a trip from New York. He was not listed on the manifests as a passenger or member of the crew, and there is no record that he was inspected as required by the immigration law. The petitioner has stated that the immigration officers came aboard but that he was not asked any questions by them.

"On January 21, 1938, the petitioner arrived at Honolulu, T. H., on the yacht *Vega*, which was registered in the name of his wife, on a trip from Jacksonville, Fla. The manifest data on file with the Immigration Service show that he was manifested as having been born in Kansas, and he was, therefore, not inspected. The petitioner has stated that he did not claim to have been born in Kansas and he was not asked any questions by the immigration officers.

"All of the facts in connection with the petitioner's reentries into the United States were presented to the Department in Washington, and it was decided on July 10, 1941, that, in view of all of the evidence, it was not a proper case in which to institute deportation proceedings.

"The records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that for the past several years it has been shown on the petitioner's income-tax returns that he is a citizen of the United States. The petitioner has stated that his returns were made out by an auditor; that he only went over the work sheets with the auditor and did not know that the completed forms showed that he was a citizen and that he believes the auditor assumed he was a citizen and he is certain that he did not state to him that he was. It is understood that the classification as a citizen

would not have changed the amount of the tax.

"The records of the Customs Service, Los Angeles, show that the Rohl-Connolly Co., of which the petitioner is the president, owned and operated a number of vessels from 1934 to 1940 in violation of the law in that the petitioner, who was the president of and a stockholder in the company, was an alien. The penalty provided is forfeiture of the vessels. The petitioner, however, made a cash settlement of the claim against the company on September 4, 1941, of \$25,000. It does not appear that there was a willful violation of the law and no criminal action is contemplated.

"The petitioner is the president of the Rohl-Connolly Contracting Co., located at 4351 Valley Boulevard, Los Angeles, and has been awarded a secret contract in connection with a defense construction project in Honolulu. His participation in this project is being held up until he has been naturalized."

As the lawful spouse of an American citizen, he was entitled, under section 310 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, to make direct application for citizenship.

Mr. President, I am advised the official record further shows that, instead of the petitions of 2 other aliens being considered by the court at the time the Rohl petition was being considered there were 27 other petitions of aliens before the court and 9 civil matters; among the civil matters was one of the famous cases tried in California, known as the United States versus Ballard, which went to the Supreme Court of the United States. The courtroom was crowded. It was evidently an error to say that this was a "special hearing."

The State of California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities made its report on this same matter to the State Senate of California on April 16, 1945, Senate Journal, page 1425. The report was presented by Senator Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles County, and I quote from that report on the Rohl matter as follows:

When the immigration investigators had completed their work they recommended that Rohl's application for citizenship be denied and that he be prosecuted for violation of the Federal law. The report and recommendation of the investigators was made to the Chief of the Naturalization Bureau. In spite of the report and recommendation, no objection was raised by the Department of Justice in the memorandum handed the Federal district judge in the naturalization proceedings. Rohl was granted citizenship September 15, 1941, in the Federal district court in Los Angeles by Judge J. F. T. O'Connor.

It should be stated here that no implication of any kind is raised against Judge J. F. T. O'Connor. The chairman of the committee and its investigators have carefully examined the records of Judge O'Connor's court for September 15, 1941, and find no irregularities whatsoever in connection with the granting of citizenship to Rohl. The file of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the recommendation of the Federal agents were not before Judge O'Connor at the time naturalization was granted. The memorandum before the judge at the time of Rohl's hearing stated that "No objection will be made to the granting of this petition," and concluded with the statement that the petitioner, as president of the Rohl-Connolly Contracting Co. had "been awarded a secret contract in connection with a defense construction project in Honolulu" and that "his participation in this project is be-

ing held up until he has been naturalized." With this memorandum before him and no legal objection having been raised in the hearing, the judge could do nothing less than grant Rohl naturalization. The memorandum had been prepared by the Department of Justice and handed to the court, and fully justified the decision of the judge in granting Rohl citizenship.

If the Government of the United States was satisfied to award a German alien an important "secret contract in connection with a defense construction project," certainly a judge of the United States district court could not refuse to grant citizenship under the circumstances. To do anything else would, in addition to a reversal by the circuit court, have subjected the judge to serious criticism, particularly in view of the disaster that occurred at Pearl Harbor 2½ months later.

The committee has learned that the procedure in the Rohl naturalization incident was the routine generally followed. Comment has been made that the Rohl proceeding was a "special" proceeding, but the record reveals that about 27 applicants were heard by Judge O'Connor on that day. There were no circumstances before the court that would have tended to put Judge O'Connor on inquiry and the committee finds that he acted with full integrity and patriotism.

Although Judge O'Connor was not aware of the fact, an attempt had been made to give the Rohl application preferential treatment. A letter written on the stationery of the United States Department of Justice is evidence of the insistence of someone that Rohl's application for citizenship be made "a special case." This letter was dated February 4, 1941, and marked "Special." It was directed to the District Director, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Los Angeles, Calif., and signed "Lemuel B. Schofield, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, by: P. B. Shoemaker, Deputy Commissioner." It reads as follows:

"It is understood that one (Hans or John) Wilhelm Rohl made application for the certificate of arrival in your office on the third instant.

"The services of this alien will be used in connection with the defense program. Please make it a special case. It is meant by this that the application for certificate of arrival should be made special, the filing of a petition also, and the hearing, if it can be immediately disposed of, after the 30 days after its filing.

"Report in connection in this case when it has been finally disposed of will be appreciated."

When asked on the witness stand why he had not made an application for admission to citizenship at an earlier date, Rohl merely shrugged his shoulders and stated: "Negligence—busy traveling—never gave it a thought" (vol. xv, p. 3807).

#### CONGRESSIONAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the last session of the Senate I referred to an editorial in the Washington Post with reference to the general expense account to be allowed to the House, and which was rejected by the Senate. I now should like to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald entertains a different view from that of the Washington Post, and is an earnest advocate of the allowance of the expense account.

I refer to these two newspapers, Mr. President, because they are our "home" papers, the Senate having solemnly decreed the other day that Washington is

our home, and I know that Senators would like to be advised of what their home papers are saying.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Times-Herald's editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a good deal more to be said, we believe, on this general subject of Government salaries.

For one thing, the Nation has been edified in the last few days by the superheated episode of the \$2,500 tax-free expense allowance which Members of the House recently voted for each Member. When a like proposition came before the Senate, the Senate decided against such allowances for its own Members but declined to interfere with the House grant of same to House Members.

#### CONGRESS SALARIES

The Senate's refusal was put on grounds of nobility; actually, it was because the Senate lacked enough Members with the courage to vote the allowance to Senators. The fact is, we are convinced, that both Senators and Congressmen should be paid \$25,000 a year apiece instead of the present \$10,000. It would seem in order to require that they pay regular income taxes on these salaries, so as to keep them as acutely conscious of income taxes as the rest of us are. They should, however, be entitled to take out for legitimate business expenses, necessary entertaining, etc., like any other taxpayers.

Plenty of people dislike the notion of higher congressional salaries. We can understand how a farmer, for instance, making only \$1,000 cash a year, thinks \$10,000 a year is enough for any Member of Congress.

Just the same, Members of both Houses of Congress should be paid \$25,000. At that salary, any Federal lawmaker can afford to be somewhat more courageous, honest, resistant to pressure groups, and so on, than some Federal lawmakers can be on \$10,000 a year.

It is of great importance, too, to strengthen Congress, so as to preserve the proper balance between it and the executive branch of the Government—which under Roosevelt was grabbing more and more power.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Washington Post has an editorial this morning on the subject, in order that the record may be complete, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed following the excerpt from the other newspaper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL PAY

Since we mentioned, a few days ago, the Dirksen bill to set up a commission on congressional salaries, support for that proposal has come from various other sources. Legislators see in Mr. DIRKSEN's bill a chance to back away from the \$2,500 expense allowance which the House recently voted for its Members, without giving up hope for increased remuneration to offset their higher expenses. This response confirms our belief that substitution of the Dirksen bill for the \$2,500 expense allowance would be a constructive method of settling what has become, for the House, an embarrassing controversy.

Some Members of the House are especially annoyed because the Senate took a holler-than-thou attitude on the \$2,500 expense allowance after approving various expense



funds for its own Members. One estimate places the value of these allowances for stationery, telephone calls and so forth at more than \$4,000 additional per Senator. Here again the Dirksen bill comes into the picture. Whatever these allowances are, they should be brought to public notice. Some Members of the House are proposing to do precisely that by a public hearing, but the result would be to ensnarl the two Houses in a row that could scarcely be expected to evolve a constructive solution. Far more promising would be a thorough examination of the facts and the problem of congressional pay by an impartial and independent body.

Congress may as well face the fact that it will be criticized for any increase in compensation to its Members that originates within the Congress itself. It is the only body in the Government able to fix the pay of its own Members. For that very reason it has to move in this field with the utmost restraint. We think it would be a stroke of statesmanship on the part of Congress to place the whole issue in the hands of an impartial body beyond the influence of its own members. The findings of such a body would doubtless be accepted by the public with little question, and Congress would escape the necessity of lowering its prestige to enhance its Members' income.

#### EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases, which was, on page 2, line 3, after "States", to insert "in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment passed over.

The amendment passed over was, under the heading "General fund, construction," on page 68, line 19, after the name "California", to strike out "\$4,500,000" and to insert "\$4,715,300, including \$115,000 for planning of the Delta steam power plant and \$100,000 for planning of transmission lines."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a controversial matter, and I think it deserves a brief explanation on my part.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. There was a divided vote on this amendment in the committee of 9 to 8, and it was put over until today so that it might be argued. Would the Senator yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose if the Senator so desires.

Mr. BURTON. It seems to me that if the Senator is about to make an explanation, we should have a quorum present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

Mr. BURTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	Morse
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Donnell	La Follette	Taft
Downey	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Tydings
Gerry	McKellar	Walsh
Guffey	McMahon	Wiley
Hart	Moore	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are absent in Europe on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent in Europe on official business for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business of the Senate as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are absent on official business of the Senate as members of a subcommittee of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. BUSHFIELD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m. Mr. WILLIS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 2:30 O'CLOCK P. M.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a number of Senators are on their way to the Senate, but rather than merely sit around waiting, I move that the Senate adjourn until 2:30 o'clock p. m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until 2:30 o'clock p. m. this day.

#### AFTER ADJOURNMENT

(Legislative day of June 4, 1945)

The Senate met at 2:30 o'clock p. m. Rev. Daniel W. Justice, minister, Trinity Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose spirit is the remedy for the ills, the woes, and the injustices of our human society, may we always be true to Thee. Continue to teach us that justice, freedom, righteousness, and brotherliness are all natural fruits of our faith in the living God.

We beseech Thee to save nations from being torn from their foundations by force and folly. We would be alert and heed the promise that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We especially pray that these our responsible representatives and law-makers of this land we love shall be guided by Thee in all deliberations and decisions, and may we ever hold our citizenship as a sacred trust from Thee.

In the name of the redeeming Lord, we humbly and earnestly pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of that part of the calendar day of June 4, 1945, embraced in the legislative day of Thursday, May 31, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DENNIS F. DONOVAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 12, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee Room, Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Dennis F. Donovan, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota, vice George F. Sullivan, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

#### REPORTS ON REAL PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of reports of all institutions, organizations, corporations, and associations, other than the United States Government, government of the District of Columbia and foreign governments, owning in the District of Columbia real property which is exempt from taxation, which (with the accompanying papers), was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Colby, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in periodicals, newspapers, motion pictures, over the radio, or any other

form of liquor advertising; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Commerce.

"Resolutions memorializing Congress relative to the establishment of a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to establish a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry, and for other purposes, printed as H. R. 1899; and

"Whereas the principal purpose of said bill is to protect maritime workers against the hazards of unemployment, said workers being the only group within the field of industry, trade, and transportation who are not so protected; and

"Whereas the persons employed in said maritime industry include thousands who are residents of Massachusetts and they are undergoing great hazards due to existing wartime conditions and are deserving of the benefits of said bill: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, as soon as possible, the bill hereinabove mentioned; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to increase the subsistence allowances for war veterans while pursuing educational courses under the GI bill of rights, so-called

"Whereas the thousands of veterans of World War II who are eligible to pursue educational courses at the expense of the Federal Government under the provisions of the GI bill of rights, so-called, are prevented from doing so by reason of the inadequacy of the subsistence allowances provided thereby; and

"Whereas no war veteran should be forced to lose the advantages of procuring further education under said law because of lack of money for the subsistence of such veteran and his or her dependents while such veteran is pursuing the educational courses: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to immediately take such action as may be necessary to increase the subsistence allowances hereinabove mentioned to at least \$80 per month in the case of veterans without dependents and to at least \$125 per month in the case of veterans with dependents; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

#### PETITION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter from W. A. Burdick, director of the Rice Lake Vocational and Adult Education School, Rice Lake, Wis., transmitting a petition signed by a number of farmers in the vicinity of Rice Lake, Mikana, and Haugen, Wis., relating to the bill (S. 619) to provide vocational education and retraining, including part-

time training and work-experience programs for the occupational adjustment and readjustment of youth and adults, including persons demobilized from essential war work or from the armed services, in order that individuals and the Nation may attain economic stability and security.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burdick's letter and the petition, without the signatures attached, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICE LAKE VOCATIONAL AND  
ADULT EDUCATION SCHOOL,  
Rice Lake, Wis., May 29, 1945.

Hon. Senator WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am enclosing a petition signed by a number of farmers from the vicinity of Rice Lake, Mikana, and Haugen who happened to be enrolled in our farm machinery repair classes which were being offered under Public Law No. 373 and which are expiring this week. This law has been administered by the Wisconsin Board of Vocational and Adult Education for the United States Office of Education through our school and many others throughout the State.

These classes enable the farmers to bring in broken parts of machinery for repair or make entirely new machinery and parts. It also enables them to keep up their production of farm commodities. The farmers are in a very serious predicament due to the fact that they cannot secure parts for their machines nor can they find the skilled labor to do this work for them. The fact that the war in Europe is over has not affected this aspect of farm production as yet and in talking with these farmers, it is very obvious there is a definite need for such classes to teach the farmers how to make their own repairs.

Several of the leaders in these classes have circulated this petition without any request from the school. The vocational school is supported by city funds; therefore, it is impossible for us to use city funds to support a rural program. It is the hope of these men that you will be able to find some way to obtain an extension of Federal funds to carry on this program. While we are a city institution, we have felt that anything we could do to contribute to the war effort was within our scope and we hope that we can continue to do this work as long as there is a need for it. To do this we must have 100 percent reimbursement from Federal funds. On behalf of these farmers who have signed their names, I express my appreciation for any help or assistance you can give us.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

W. A. BURDICK,  
Director.

P. S.—I have just learned that the number of the bill now in Congress is S. 619.

RICE LAKE VOCATIONAL AND  
ADULT EDUCATION SCHOOL,  
Rice Lake, Wis., May 29, 1945.

#### To Whom It May Concern:

Inasmuch as we are in the busiest and most critical part of our productive season, using our various types of farm machines to the utmost, and due to the fact that we cannot secure repair parts or obtain skilled workers to assemble, repair, and put into operating condition our machinery, we wish to take this



means to petition you to do all in your power to continue such programs as the farm machinery repair shops that have been operating in Rice Lake and vicinity under Public Law No. 373, through the Rice Lake Vocational School. Up to the present time these classes have been our salvation through which we have learned to do much of this repair and the construction work ourselves. We cannot secure the tools or parts or even new machinery. We appreciate the fact that we have learned most of the fundamentals of this type of work in the classes involved at this school and therefore we petition you to continue these courses either through a new law or by some Federal and because the Rice Lake Vocational School cannot finance rural programs on city funds.

#### RESOLUTION FAVORING ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the executive board of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A postwar economy of full employment depends on the greatest possible development of our natural resources, including power, our transportation facilities, and our foreign trade. To serve these and other ends, President Roosevelt has advocated a series of regional development projects similar to the TVA. Of these, the one which would be of the utmost immediate benefit to the Middle West is the St. Lawrence seaway.

At a total estimated cost to the United States of \$277,000,000, or only a little more than the present daily cost of the war, the St. Lawrence seaway project would produce an immense amount of power and would open the St. Lawrence River to navigation by fully loaded, oceangoing vessels. Power production, with an installed horsepower of 2,200,000, would amount to 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually—an amount greater than all the power produced by the TVA in 1943. Moreover, the power can be produced at a cost lower than anywhere else on the American Continent.

The St. Lawrence seaway would provide the most economical route from the Midwest to the Atlantic seaboard and would wipe out the handicap of high freight rates, which has hampered the Midwest in competing for foreign markets. It would bring Detroit and other Great Lake ports as close to the ports of northern Europe as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

The seaway would be a particular boon to the automobile industry, which before the war exported something like 10 percent of its total output, and which after the war must export more nearly one-fifth of its output if we are to maintain the high levels of employment in the industry which we hope for and expect. The United States Department of Commerce has calculated that savings to the industry in transportation costs would run into the millions of dollars, amounting to some \$20 per car. An amount as large as this would have a significant effect in facilitating foreign shipments abroad.

The seaway will also add greatly to national defense by making use of the harbors of the Great Lakes during wartime for shipbuilding and shipping direct to ocean waters: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the UAW executive board endorse the St. Lawrence seaway project and instruct the legislative department to do what it can to assist those groups and those Members of Congress who are actively supporting the project.

#### RESOLUTION OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN OPPOSITION TO MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, a letter from Mr. N. Jay Leonard, Secretary of the Leavenworth, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, and the accompanying resolutions adopted by the Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce on May 11, 1945.

I believe this resolution, opposing the enactment of S. 555, the so-called Missouri Valley Authority bill, expresses succinctly and correctly the basic objections of the large majority of the people living in the Missouri Valley to the enactment of such legislation. I know that is the way the people of Kansas feel about the matter, they are much disturbed over the economic power proposed to be placed in a Government corporation, and they have a right to be disturbed.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Leavenworth, Kans., May 29, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce in regular session, Friday, May 11, 1945. Your cooperation in the support of said resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,

N. JAY LEONARD,  
Secretary.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for additional flood control and also for a further development of navigation and irrigation on the Missouri River; and

Whereas said improvements should be made at the earliest possible time in view of the destruction of life and property and the loss to industry, agriculture, and commerce caused by recent floods and the continuous waste of valuable water resources within this basin; and

Whereas improvements of the type contemplated have been carried on in the past by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior; and

Whereas the said Government agencies have had charge of such development for many years and have planned and are prepared to execute the said works of improvement without delay at the conclusion of the war; and

Whereas, it has been suggested that in order the further the progress of this development, a Missouri Valley Authority should be formed with broad powers similar to those of the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of Leavenworth, Kans.:

1. That we endorse the aforementioned improvement program and recommend and urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, as now authorized by law, be given immediate adequate appropriation so that the plan can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy.

2. That we commend the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for their action in effecting coordination of their activities within the Missouri River Basin.

3. That we oppose Senate bill 555, introduced on February 15, 1945, and which has been referred to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because such bill would—

(a) Create a Federal corporation clothed with the power of government, fortified by law with the functional flexibility of a private corporation, and freed of all the legal restraints which experience has demonstrated are necessary and desirable.

(b) Place the States within the Missouri Valley Basin subservient to a superstate controlled by three men, so far as the control and development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley are concerned.

(c) Stifle industrial growth, individual enterprise, and agricultural development inasmuch as the proposed Federal corporation would be in control of a basic economic resource.

(d) Grant to such administrative agency unchecked authority to engage in private business, operate farms, remove hundreds of thousands of acres from the tax roll, take over the administration of education and of local and State laws, and in general, do the economic planning for the entire area, and which would be detrimental to the best interests of the city of Leavenworth, the State of Kansas, and the Nation at large.

4. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member from Kansas in the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 325).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 812. A bill to amend section 3 of the San Carlos Act (43 Stat. 475-476), as supplemented and amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 326).

#### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation five lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

#### MEAT DISTRIBUTION AND THE MEAT BLACK MARKET—REPORT OF CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Report of Chester Bowles, Administrator, to Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, dealing with meat distribution and the meat black market. I am glad to note that Mr. Bowles intends to file another report on the same subject at the end of this month.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

REPORT OF CHESTER BOWLES, ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION, TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 30, 1945  
MEAT DISTRIBUTION AND THE MEAT BLACK MARKET

This report to Members of Congress will outline the steps taken by OPA to improve meat distribution and to combat meat black-market activities during the last few weeks. Broadly speaking, there are two types of slaughterers:

1. The federally inspected slaughterers, who alone can legally meet the requirements of the armed forces, and who alone can legally ship meat across State lines and to supply those civilians living in States producing only limited supplies of meat.

2. The nonfederally inspected commercial slaughterers and farm slaughterers, who are limited in their distribution to the State in which they are situated.

The basic cause of maldistribution of meat during the last few months lies in the substantial growth of the amount of livestock being slaughtered in nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses. This growth has sharply reduced the amount of meat available to the federally inspected plants. Naturally the federally inspected slaughterers have had to take care of the needs of the armed services first. For this reason they have had less and less meat available to ship across State lines to the low meat-producing areas, principally our large cities.

#### CHANNELING MEAT TO LOW-PRODUCING AREAS

In April, as you know, OPA was given authority to control the slaughter of livestock by all nonfederally inspected slaughterers. A program was immediately worked out which called for the registry of all farm and nonfederally inspected commercial slaughterers throughout the country. This program was designed to increase the supply of livestock going to the federally inspected packers.

On May 14, under our new authority, the licenses previously issued by the Government to the 23,436 nonfederally inspected commercial slaughterers were canceled. At the same time, new licenses were issued with individual quotas to all nonfederally inspected slaughterers who registered and met our basic requirements.

These quotas were based on the number of animals which each nonfederally inspected slaughterer had killed and sold legitimately during 1944. All nonfederally inspected slaughterers who failed during any quarter of 1944 to turn in ration stamps to cover the meat they sold were refused quotas. All nonfederally inspected slaughterers who handed in fewer ration stamps than the amount of livestock which they claimed to have killed were given quotas based on the number of ration stamps they turned in.

In other words, we based our quotas on legitimate operations and not on black market inflated figures.

By May 25, only 15,220 nonfederally inspected slaughterers had registered with OPA for their quotas. No doubt, some of those who have not registered still intend to do so. It is safe to say, however, that the great majority of the 11,000 which failed to apply had been operating in the black market. Today they no longer can do business.

The legitimate, established nonfederally inspected slaughterers, although operating henceforth under a quota, will be rid of this chiseling black-market competition. With few exceptions, they will be assured a good return on their operations by the new pricing program announced recently. Those who operated profitably before the war will be protected against loss by a so-called "bail out" provision in a recent OPA regulation.

This program will result in the flow of additional livestock to the federally inspected plants. These extra supplies will enable this group of slaughterers to increase their shipments to low meat-producing areas.

To assure that this meat is actually shipped to the areas where the shortage has been greatest we are about to issue an "area distribution" order. This order will require all slaughterers to ship to all counties in the same proportion that they shipped in the first quarter of 1944 (a reasonably normal period).

#### PROGRESS IN ENFORCEMENT

As I have pointed out many times, OPA has been woefully short of investigators. In early April we had, on the average, only one investigator to cover each county in the United States. At that time Congress appropriated some additional funds to increase our investigative staff in meat. We have transferred additional investigators from other fields to the meat program. This has left us with a very short staff to obtain compliance with all our price control, rent control, and rationing regulations.

In the meat field, with our augmented staff, we have moved aggressively against black-market operations at the slaughtering level, and also among hotels, wholesalers, and retailers.

As a result of this stepped-up campaign, 462 new meat-enforcement cases were begun last week, 390 the preceding week, and 355 the week before, a total of 1,207 new cases. Cases are now being instituted at nine times the rate of 2 months ago and more than 15 times the rate of 1 year ago.

It has been our experience that vigorous enforcement action on a rationed product invariably leads to the increased use of counterfeit ration coupons. In the case of meat, these counterfeits are purchased by slaughterers, wholesalers, and retailers to attempt to cover up illegal sales.

During the last year we have checked this type of activity on gasoline through a scientific analysis of all used gasoline coupons as they flow from the trade through our verification centers. Through this method counterfeiting on gasoline has already been reduced to one-tenth of 1 percent.

Starting on May 1 in all OPA regions, a similar check was begun of all used ration coupons on meat, fats and oils, and sugar. Each individual coupon is now being examined under ultraviolet rays to establish its authenticity. All counterfeit coupons are traced as rapidly as they are discovered to the processor, wholesaler, or retailer from whom they originate.

Already as a result of this new activity our enforcement staff has established several important black-market cases.

The two programs outlined in this report, as I pointed out, will not increase our total supply of meat. This can only come through the stepped-up hog production, and through the increase in cattle feeding. Both of these objectives, as you know, have been dealt with in the program announced by the Vinson office a week ago.

The program which I have described above will assist greatly in establishing fair distribution of the supplies which we have available. It will also prove a powerful factor in defeating the black market in meat.

We have received many reports from legitimate slaughterers, wholesalers, and retailers welcoming the drastic action which we are taking. They don't like the black market. They want to see it licked.

I will again report within the next 30 days. At that time, I believe, considerably further progress will have been made.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1097. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. HATCH (by request) introduced Senate bill 1098, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 1099. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. Spiker and Fred W. Jandrey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1102. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States Naval Convalescent Hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945; and

S. 1103. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Quonset Hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. McKellar, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. DONNELL) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 73, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### LANDS ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by request I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof, and in connection therewith I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which explains the bill, be printed in the *RECORD*.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1098) declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof, introduced by Mr. HATCH (by request), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1945.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: There is submitted herewith the draft of a proposed bill, declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for the administration thereof. The bill is substantially identical with H. R. 5880, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, passed by the House of Representatives on March 16, 1942, and H. R. 838, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, introduced in the House of Representatives on January 7, 1943. I request that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and recommend its enactment.



In order to invoke the benefit of the provisions of the subsection (a), section 321, Part II, title III of the Transportation Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 954, 49 U. S. C. sec. 65), providing for the elimination of lower rates for certain Government transportation services, a number of railroad carriers filed under subsection (b) of that section releases of their claims to land grants in aid of railroad construction made to them or their predecessors.

By virtue of the approval by this Department of releases in accordance with the Transportation Act, claims for a considerable acreage of lands have been so released. The proposed legislation would prevent uncertainty and confusion in the administration of such lands and aid in the consolidation of checkerboard areas within existing reservations and withdrawals. Thus, it would be clear, under the bill, that lands lying within the exterior boundaries of a particular reservation, such as a national forest or a grazing district, would be a part of the reservation within which they lie and subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal agency administering that reservation.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,  
Secretary of the Interior.

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ARTICLE BY HON. JOHN J. MCCLOY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Do Not Want Another War," written by Hon. John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WORLD SECURITY—EDITORIAL FROM VERMONT FARM BUREAU NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on world security, published in the Vermont Farm Bureau News for June 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION—LETTER FROM REV. L. L. SCOTT

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Rev. L. L. Scott, of Savannah, Ga., replying to attacks made upon him because of his opposition to the so-called FEPC, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO. AND MONTGOMERY CITY LINES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the Senate amendments as follows: Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "to" over to and including "collision" on page 2, line 22, and insert: "Montgomery City Lines, Inc., Montgomery, Ala., the sum of \$266.49, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by it as the result of a collision involving one of its vehicles and a United States Army truck in the city of Montgomery, Ala., on September 30, 1940."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Montgomery City Lines, Inc.," and agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEEHEE,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
W. A. PITTINGER,  
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

#### INVESTIGATION AND DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT COLLECTIVISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, it was reported that former President Herbert Hoover had recommended last summer to Republican Party officials that they concentrate on this campaign issue: Shall we combat the creeping government collectivism which has invaded every phase of American life? Shall we throw out the imported totalitarianism, stamped "Made in Europe," from our Federal system?

Many persons feel that Mr. Hoover's advice was not followed as fully as it might have been. Personally, I am of the opinion that this crucial issue could have been and should have been presented more emphatically to the American voter. Whether it would have turned the tide of the last campaign is not the question now. The question now is: Shall we investigate and assemble all the facts on certain vital questions relating to this creeping collectivism? And when Congress gets these facts in answer to these questions, shall it relate them with all the force at its command to the American people?

Shall Congress present the facts not in isolation, not as fragments, but in a total picture of the insidious master-plan of Government collectivism?

What are the questions the answers to which must be assembled into this total picture? They are:

First. How much of Government is in business? How far has Government gone in invading the sphere of private enterprise? How much is Government engaged in wholesaling, retailing, banking, lending, providing electric power, distilling, insuring, mining, transporting, constructing, and the like, which are normally the functions of the people? How far have Government corporations gone in the manner of financial giants in stifling the independence of American enterprise?

I think that when we get the answer to those questions, it will be a shocking answer. I think that the answer will prove that it is 11:59 on the clock of the life of private enterprise as our people have known it for generations. I think the answer will show that the policies, thinking, and plans of many of those still in high places indicate that they intend nothing short of a collectivist State. I think when we get these answers, Amer-

ica will demand that Government immediately get out of business!

Second. How much has the Federal Government invaded the sphere of State and local Governments? How far has the bureaucracy of Washington, D. C., gone to centralize the powers which under the United States Constitution and our system of checks and balances should actually be in the hands of State and local authorities? I think that when the American people get the answer to these questions, they will demand that the Federal Government quit poaching in the domain of the States and localities!

Third. How much have business principles pervaded Government? Have our Federal agencies made any effective attempt to husband the money appropriated to them? How much have the American people lost through the inefficiency, extravagance, duplication, poor staffing, and overstaffing of the Federal Government? The Bureau of the Budget is supposed to provide for efficiency in the executive branch of the Government in accordance with the wishes of the President. How good a job has it done?

I think that when we get the answer to those questions we shall find that business principles of conservation and economy have made little, if no headway, in our governmental life. I think that those answers will show that the financial wealth of our people has been recklessly thrown away in the most debonair collectivist manner. And I think that our people will demand that Government get some business sense into its system.

I think that our people will demand that a Government-owned enterprise such as the TVA, which was created by funds from the Federal Treasury—that of the 48 States—give some financial return to the Federal Government rather than merely providing benefits through uneconomical low rates to the people of the Tennessee Valley.

Uncle Sam is going to need every cent of income in order to take care of the interest charge on his 300 billion dollars of indebtedness and to take care of his high overhead.

It is high time that we view the American scene rather than look constantly abroad. It is high time that we get the facts on the invasion of the American scene by imported collectivism.

When we have the whole picture of those facts, our people will be able to form their own intelligent judgment, and Congress will be able to act forthrightly to eradicate Government collectivism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL OF 1945—LETTER FROM JUDGE VINSON

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on January 22 the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and I introduced the full-employment bill of 1945. This bill is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on the bill have been requested from almost every Federal agency. As the reports are being received, I am having them analyzed and digested so that a complete summary of all the reports will soon be available to the committee and to the general public.

At this time I should like to call special attention to the report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which was released this morning from the White House. In this report, Judge Vinson wholeheartedly endorses the full-employment bill and describes it as "the necessary first step from which a full-dress program of economic policies to promote the well-being of our free competitive economy will stem."

History shows us—

Says Judge Vinson—

that business, labor, and agriculture cannot in themselves assure the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. The Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must assume this responsibility and take measures broad enough to meet the issues. Only by looking at the economy as a whole, and adopting national economic policies which will actively promote and encourage the expansion of business and the maintenance of markets and consumer spending, can we hope to achieve full employment. Senate bill 380 recognizes this responsibility of Government and seeks to provide a definite vehicle for the Congress and the President to measure the size of the employment need of the country and to provide specific programs for meeting it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report to the Banking and Currency Committee from the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR BOB: This is in response to your letter of April 9 concerning S. 380, a bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Next to a speedy and complete victory over Japan, a steady, well-paid job after the war is first in the minds and hearts of most Americans. The war has demonstrated that our economic system can provide jobs when demand for its product exists. It has done more. It has opened the eyes of all of us to the vast productivity of which American labor and the American genius for organization and management—working as a team—are capable.

But these jobs—this productivity—has been achieved in wartime through the creation of an unlimited market by the Government. To reach and maintain high levels of employment and a steadily rising standard of living in peacetime will call for a program suited to peacetime conditions and needs. In this program, business, agriculture, labor, and local, State, and Federal Governments must all play their parts.

We know we have an abundance of resources, plant, manpower, and managerial know-how to produce a standard of living far higher than anything we have ever known. Likewise, we know that we have unfilled

needs in America so diverse and so great as to challenge the capacity of even the greatest producing nation on earth.

But needs are not demands, in the economic sense. People must have steady income and they must want to spend their income before needs become demands and people become customers.

Business management, large and small, has a great opportunity and a great challenge to help create these steady incomes, and to actuate demand by expanding their businesses, offering better goods and services at attractive prices. Labor and agriculture through their efforts to increase production per man-hour can contribute importantly to higher incomes and a higher standard of living.

But history shows us that business, labor, and agriculture cannot in themselves assure the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. The Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must assume this responsibility and take measures broad enough to meet the issues. Only by looking at the economy as a whole, and adopting national economic policies which will actively promote and encourage the expansion of business and the maintenance of markets and consumer spending, can we hope to achieve full employment. S. 380 recognizes this responsibility of Government and seeks to provide a definite vehicle for the Congress and the President to measure the size of the employment need of the country and to provide specific programs for meeting it.

It would be idle to pretend that it will be easy to reach and hold full-employment levels. It would be folly, on the other hand, to pretend that it is impossible. The American people will not be content to go back to protracted large scale unemployment. It is imperative that we find ways and means to provide jobs for those willing and able to work. Depressions are not acts of God, any more than wars are. They are the product of our man-made institutions and the way we organize our society. We can and must organize to prevent both.

We must be prepared to make changes. At the same time we must be jealous of any encroachment on our freedom. National economic policies must not be allowed to develop into regimentation of business, or labor, or agriculture, nor of the people. Direction of private output by public authority in peacetime is repugnant to American ways of thought. Instead the maximum possible freedom must be afforded every producer to produce what he wishes, in the amounts for which he can best find a profitable market. Given an adequate market, our producers will supply the goods and the employment. We can be sure of that.

We cannot, however, leave the creation of that market to chance. We must start now to find out what measures are needed to maintain markets and steady jobs. S. 380 does not profess to present a fully conceived program for the achievement of full employment. It is the necessary first step from which a full-dress program of economic policies to promote the well-being of our free competitive economy will stem.

As a former member of Congress, I have certain general reactions to the bill. I regard it as desirable that such a bill should limit itself to providing the machinery to be followed to assist in arriving at national policy and full employment, rather than attempting to specify in advance policy measures to be used to meet future conditions. I believe it wise to leave to the President full discretion in the matter of preparing estimates of the national production and employment budget. And I regard the consideration of proposed measures by a congressional joint committee, which can analyze the inter-relationships between the various matters of special concern to the House and

Senate committees represented, as an important step in the process of preparing national policy to maintain full employment.

I heartily endorse the purposes and principles of the bill.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 510) to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom "40 percent reserve hereinbefore required" and by inserting in lieu thereof "25 percent reserve hereinbefore required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 percent the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 percent, and when said reserve falls below 20 percent a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 2. The second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Any Federal Reserve bank may make application to the local Federal Reserve agent for such amount of the Federal Reserve notes hereinbefore provided for as it may require. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes thus applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances acquired under the provisions of section 13 of this act, or bills of exchange endorsed by a member bank of any Federal Reserve district



and purchased under the provisions of section 14 of this act, or bankers' acceptances purchased under the provisions of said section 14, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. In no event shall such collateral security be less than the amount of Federal Reserve notes applied for. The Federal Reserve agent shall each day notify the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of all issues and withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes to and by the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited. The said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may at any time call upon a Federal Reserve bank for additional security to protect the Federal Reserve notes issued to it."

SEC. 3. All power and authority with respect to the issuance of circulating notes, known as Federal Reserve bank notes, pursuant to the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1, 6), shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. All power and authority of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury under section 43 (b) (1) of the act approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31, 52), with respect to the issuance of United States notes, shall cease and terminate on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate resume consideration of House bill 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate has completed consideration of all the committee amendments to the Interior Department appropriation bill save one, which appears on page 66, lines 19 to 22. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, after line 18, after the word "California", it is proposed to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$4,715,300, including \$115,300 for planning of the Delta steam power plant and \$100,000 for planning of transmission lines."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that this is the one amendment presented by the committee upon which there was a divided vote in the committee, the vote being 9 in favor and 8 against the amendment as it now appears in the bill. This amendment is the one controversial matter in the bill which has been reserved for discussion in the Senate. Therefore, I believe a quorum should be present. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hatch	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Billbo	Hill	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	La Follette	Tydings
Chavez	Langer	Wagner
Donnell	Lucas	Walsh
Downey	McKellar	Wiley
Ellender	McMahon	Willis
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Morse	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent visiting battlefields in Europe.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are absent in Europe on official business for the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business in Europe for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business of the Senate as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are absent on official business of the Senate as members of a subcommittee of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A week ago today I made a brief statement in the Senate with respect to the importance of proceeding with the trials of war criminals in Europe. During the past week I have watched with considerable care the dispatches which have come from Paris and London discussing the procedure proposed for such trials. Candidly I am somewhat disappointed in discovering that the procedure at the present moment is to try some of the small fry, and delay the trial of the major criminals who were responsible for the war of aggression, and for the torture and murder of millions of innocent men, women, and children.

Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate who believes more strongly than I in attempting to achieve unity between all allied nations with respect to the grave international problems which now confront the world. But in connection with the war criminals of Europe who were responsible for the war it seems to me that a difference exists so far as unity is concerned. It is most desirable that there be unity among the allied nations with respect to the trials of the various war criminals who have been listed by the War Crimes Commission, and by the armies of the respective nations, and I wish to repeat what I said a week ago, namely, that I hope there may be unity in the trial of these war criminals. It is my earnest desire to see Russia, England, France, and America sit around the table, and finally arrive at the proper plan and procedure to be followed in connection with these trials. But at the same time, if those nations cannot agree, I repeat with emphasis, that as to the major criminals who at the present time are in custody of the American Army, it is the duty of this Nation to proceed with its own plans with respect to their trials.

In connection with that thought I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of

my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "Get on With the War Crimes Trials." It is one of the most interesting editorials I have read in dealing with the trials of persons committing war crimes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET ON WITH THE WAR CRIMES TRIALS!

With every passing day it appears more and more likely that the Allied nations—the very countries which all but wrecked themselves to wipe out a monstrous evil—may fumble and dilly-dally and quibble over technicalities until the authors of that evil plant the seeds of another world holocaust and then die of a mocking old age.

From the moment top Nazis began their whining parade to captivity we have seen nothing but a series of hedging, timid, dilatory maneuvers by those responsible for their prosecution, apparently all springing from disagreements and rows over judicial methods. There has been none of the summary justice for these criminals the world expected. There has been none of the swift punishment which would be an object lesson to ambitious underlings who might later attempt to emulate Hitler. In fact, self-administered poison and bullets to date have been far more effective than war crimes courts in dealing justice to the Nazis. Wherever Himmler and previous German suicides are today, they must regret they didn't stick around awhile.

It has been many months since it was sternly announced the War Crimes Commission would list the enemy leaders destined for trial. It was intended as a fearsome warning which would hasten the Reich's defeat and heighten immeasurably the morale of the oppressed peoples. Yet today we have the official identification of only one "big name" on the list—Hermann Goering.

Justice Jackson, chief United States counsel for prosecution of war criminals, has just arrived in Paris. He was quoted yesterday as stating that Germans accused of crimes against American troops—the small fry—will go on trial within a few weeks, but sees no prospect of immediate trial of the higher-up Nazis. Not until the Allies can agree on "certain details" of the international military court can proceedings start. A ridiculous split over methods is holding up the entire program, and the only reason we learned this much about the mysterious goings-on was because the dispute generated so much steam it blew off the lid of secrecy for a moment.

What effect is all this subsequent dawdling going to have on the morale of the oppressed peoples? What effect on the soldiers who have left arms and legs on the battlefield that these men might be captured for trial? What effect on the mothers and fathers and wives of sons who will never come home? What effect on the small nations which look to the big ones for world justice?

What difference does it make if the criminals are tried by a military court or civil court? What difference if the jurists are American or French or British or Greek? Political repercussions? Perhaps. But they should be ignored. For they cannot be serious enough to justify delaying the trials until the crime is forgotten or misguided milkops win a campaign of "forgiveness." Whatever method is the fastest should be used.

Americans have had too good a view of stalling tactics in their own courts to be tolerant of the present situation. If felons here too often go free through legal technicalities, how much greater is the opportunity for the Nazis under a multitude of international niceties.

It is time to end this quibbling and muddling with a mob of gangsters responsible for the starvation, torture, and slaughter of millions of innocent persons. A meeting of the Big Three is due soon in London or Germany. A decision on how to cut red tape and swiftly start the punishment of the greatest criminals the world has ever known should get top billing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish also to read into the RECORD at this time a letter which I received from an American soldier. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: I am an American soldier just back from the hell in Germany, and after reading the enclosed short news bulletin, I couldn't help but write you these few lines to let you know that I am 100 percent for you.

Also enclosed you will find a clipping that I took from a Reader's Digest while on the boat coming home. Everything in it, and a lot more that can't be printed, is absolutely true.

This letter came to me as a result of a short news bulletin in one of the Boston newspapers in which had been quoted three lines of what I had said in regard to trying the German general staff.

I continue reading:

German generals, every damn one of them, are just as guilty as the butchers who ran the prison camps in Europe.

I was looking over one of my first Boston newspapers that I have seen in a long time, only to get fighting mad as I looked at the grinning faces of German generals who thought their capture was only the end of a "game."

The "game" is over for them, for a while, but permanently for my buddies that fell, screaming with pain. They were just kids, like myself, who instead of being in college, were fighting a heartless enemy who would destroy everything and everyone they love.

The leaders of these so-called supermen are going to be let loose, they tell me. "Defeated leaders" is what one newspaper calls them, but "butchers" is better.

Please, sir, in the name of God and those kids that won't be coming back, don't let them get away with it. The next generation will be fighting the "next" war, unless Germany is made to pay this time.

God bless you, and your courage to speak up.

Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Justice Jackson is back in this country, or soon will be back. It seems to me that the American people at this time are entitled to know from his lips exactly what has been done up to this moment with respect to plans and procedures for the trial of the war criminals in the Old World.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] call emphatic attention to the sacrifices which have been made by the fighting men of the United States. I think it may properly be said that the people of no nation in all history made a greater contribution to the fight for freedom than have the people of the United States. The casualties which we have suffered in this war to date number more than a million, and the war is not yet over.

Mr. President, I venture to make these few remarks because this morning all the members of the Committee on Post

Offices and Post Roads who are in the city have joined me in sponsoring a joint resolution to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue appropriate commemorative postage stamps to honor the valor, the efforts, and the sacrifices of the members of all our fighting forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution which I now introduce for myself and a number of other Senators be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and also that it be printed at length in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The joint resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 73) providing for the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating memorable victories in the cause of human freedom in Europe and Asia, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. DONNELL), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating memorable victories in the cause of human freedom in Europe and Asia

Whereas the armed forces of the United States by unexampled heroism and sacrifice have achieved memorable victories in the cause of human freedom both in Europe and Asia; and

Whereas through remarkable coordination of military, naval, and air power they invaded the long-prepared strongholds of Nazi tyranny in Africa, Italy, and France, and by superior resourcefulness and efficiency drove the professional German Wehrmacht across the Rhine and crushed it; and

Whereas in the Pacific they have utterly defeated the Japanese Navy, driving its remnants into hiding while through amphibious landings they are seizing strategic islands within the network of Japan's imperial defenses, and through unprecedented air operations they are now destroying the industrial foundation of Japanese tyranny; and

Whereas they have retaken the Philippines and bestowed real liberty upon the loyal and courageous Filipinos, thus setting an example to all the nations of the world; and

Whereas these victories were won by citizen soldiers and sailors, more than three-fourths of whom had never fired a rifle or sailed in a war vessel before Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas to win these victories they have suffered in battle and in prison camps; and Whereas more than 227,000 have lost their lives, and the total number of casualties already exceeds 1,000,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a series of special postage stamps of suitable design to commemorate the valor, the effort, and the sacrifices of the members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marine.

SEC. 2. At least one stamp shall be issued to honor each branch of the armed services of the United States.

SEC. 3. The stirring photograph of the raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, in the midst of battle by five marines and one sailor, three of whom have since been



slain, and the notable photograph of the Remagen Bridge across the Rhine, the capture of which by an American armored division took the enemy by surprise and appreciably hastened the collapse of Germany, are suitable designs.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the remaining committee amendment to be considered in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill appears on page 66. The amendment is based upon a Budget Bureau estimate. In 1937 the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] sponsored legislation authorizing the construction of what is known as the Central Valley project. In that authorizing legislation there is provision for the construction, operation, and maintenance of dams, canals, power plants, pumping stations, transmission lines, and other incidental works. So there is no question about the authority of law for Congress to appropriate \$115,300 for the planning of the Delta steam power plant and \$100,000 for planning transmission lines.

With respect to the amendment, which I should explain was not agreed to by the House of Representatives, but was included in the Budget Bureau estimate, and the Senate committee amendment is a restoration of that estimate, the committee report makes this suggestion:

This legislative authorization cannot be repealed or modified by a failure to appropriate money for the planning and construction of transmission lines and power plants except that a consistent refusal to supply the necessary funds would inevitably lead to the conclusion that it is the desire of Congress that Central Valley project power should be sold only at the bus bars of the power plants and to only one customer, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Under the law the Bureau of Reclamation has two specific duties to perform, and it has had those duties since 1906. One is that wherever a power plant or reclamation project is built the Bureau is to obtain revenue sufficient to pay into the Federal Treasury the cost of the project over a reasonable term of years. Where power is generated the Bureau of Reclamation is not authorized to give the power away, it is not authorized to sell it at less than cost, but it is authorized, under the law, to dispose of the power at a profit sufficient so that the power plants which have been built can be paid for over a period of time. That was what was done at Boulder Dam. The Federal Government built a great power development there; then the Bureau of Reclamation contracted with the city of Los Angeles and power companies in southern California to pay the cost back, and the cost is being paid back according to the contracts which have been made and according to the law. That is exactly what is proposed to be done in this instance. So anyone who fears that if the Federal Government undertakes to do in northern California the same thing it has done in southern Califor-

nia—that is, build a power plant and transmit the power and sell it, the Government will be put into the power business in unfair competition with private enterprise—is utterly mistaken. That cannot be done under the law. There must be obtained a price for the power which will reimburse the Government.

The other provision of law, which has been on the statute books since 1906, is that when the Federal Government builds a power plant and has power to sell it shall give preference to municipalities, to cooperatives, and to public power projects throughout the country, so that, if there is a limited amount of power, then a public power authority has the preference in the purchase of power. Those two policies are provided by law: first, to obtain a fair price for the power, and, second, if there is not sufficient power to go around, to give preference to public projects.

The other argument that seems to be worrying Senators with respect to this matter is that this is some sort of an entering wedge whereby the Federal Government will go into the retail distribution of power. Let me assure the Senate that the United States Reclamation Service never has been in that business. The Reclamation Service is a wholesaler of power. At no time has there been any action taken by the United States Reclamation Service to sell power other than as a wholesaler except in a few of its construction camps. I have talked with the Commissioner of Reclamation and asked him if in connection with these expenditures in California it was the desire of the Reclamation Service to transmit power from the mountains where it is generated down into central California, and then go into the retail power business. He said: "Positively no; we have no more intention of doing it here than anywhere else, and we thought, as a matter of principle, it would be a great mistake for any bureau of the Government to engage in the retail distribution of power anywhere in the United States."

The retail distribution of power is a local matter. If any city, county, or community desires to engage in that business it is done by vote of the people of the area, and then they have a preference right to purchase power from the Federal Government, but beyond that the Government is not in the business, never has been in the business, and does not expect to go into the business.

The last point I desire to make in this connection is that it is undisputed, so far as the testimony before our committee is concerned, and it is a fact, that there do not exist at this time transmission lines to carry the power from the Shasta Dam 150 or 200 miles down into central California. There is in existence a transmission line owned by the power company which carries the small amount of power that has been generated up to the present time. But the project has not been completed. Many other generators are to be put in, both at the Shasta and the Keswick Dams, and when those generators are all installed, someone must build a transmission line to take the power out from the mountains where it

is generated down to where it can be consumed. The question before the Senate is, shall that transmission line be built by the Federal Government, or shall it be built by a private power company?

The action we take here today is notice to the company that they may expect that the Federal Government will plan and have available the means of building a transmission line, and when the power is transmitted down into central California, they will plan a way to distribute the power.

The streams of California fluctuate greatly in their flow. There is a wet and dry season. Up at the Shasta Dam, it is possible to generate about 200,000 kilowatts of firm power. The remainder, the dump power, is fluctuating power, that can be firmed up with steam. So that there are 350,000 to 400,000 kilowatts an hour without the steam plant, and it is only possible to sell the firm power; the dump power has no value.

The plan of the Reclamation Service is that of the power generated at these dams, 120,000 kilowatts will be used to pump water for farming. It is quite obvious that that is the larger part of the 200,000 kilowatts of firm power that will be available. So the Government should, in my judgment, build a transmission line for that reason, if for no other, because the farmer in California, who helps pay for this project, is entitled to the cheapest possible power obtainable by him; and, secondly, it should be done so as to carry out the purpose of the law, namely, reimburse the cost of the project.

Therefore, I say that we must decide now whether or not we shall give notice to the power company, by the rejection of the pending amendment, that we do not intend ever to build a transmission line, or whether they can depend upon its erection as a certainty, so they will not be justified in investing their money in a transmission line and standby steam plant.

If the company should go ahead and build the necessary transmission line, and then Congress should change its mind, the company could very properly come in and say, "We have a great investment; we have put millions of dollars into a transmission line and power plant, and now the Federal Government comes along and wants to parallel our line and build a steam plant to take the business away from us. That would be unfair."

So we should make up our minds now whether the Federal Government is going to take this action and not put the company in a position of having the values it would invest in these lines, which would have to be built by it in the future, confiscated.

Every other place where the Reclamation Service has generated power—and it had to generate power in the mountains, where the power sites are located—the Bureau of Reclamation has brought the power out in each instance by transmission line to the place where it could be marketed, and that is the sensible, sane, sound, business way to do it. In no instance has the Reclamation Service engaged in the actual distribution and sale of power in the localities.

I wish to repeat, the Reclamation Service is a wholesaler of power; it has never been in the retail business, and does not intend to engage in that business. Therefore, if there are any who have fears of that kind, their fears are not justified.

Mr. President, I think that is all the explanation I care to make at this time.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, speaking to the amendment to which the Senator from Arizona just referred, I believe the arguments as presented before the committee should be clearly before the Senate. This amendment appears as a committee amendment, but it appears by virtue of a vote of 9 to 8 in the committee. It is obvious that it was a matter of contention in the committee.

It is not a criticism of the Central Valley project as a whole. That great \$362,000,000 project is not affected by this item except that our action is to determine whether or not some \$75,000,000 is to be spent by the Government for a transmission line and steam plant, or whether the facilities of a local utility are made use of to accomplish substantially the same result.

It is the contention of those objecting to the amendment that, in the words of the Senator from Arizona, but reversing the application, "the sensible, sound, sane, and business way" to meet this is to allow the local company, which has the investment in that area, to spend the \$75,000,000, or whatever it is necessary to spend. It is willing, able, and ready to do so, and here is a case where the purposes of the project will be carried out fully without the United States Government putting in \$75,000,000 to accomplish that result.

If it be the purpose, as I have always understood, that the Federal Government would only go into one of these projects when there was a failure of private enterprise to go into it, we have here a case in which I believe the record shows that private enterprise is ready and willing and able to render all of the required service.

To make the issue clear, the amendment to which we refer is found on page 66, in lines 19 to 22. It appears in the form of an increase in the appropriation from four and a half million dollars to \$4,715,300. That would look as though it involved only \$215,300. As a matter of fact, it consists of two planning items, the first one of \$115,300 for planning the Delta steam power plant, which, when erected, will cost \$26,000,000; and the second item is \$100,000, for planning transmission lines, which, when erected, together with switchyards, will cost some \$49,000,000.

Therefore, while at the moment it looks like \$215,300, there would be no point whatever in appropriating \$215,300 for making these plans unless it were contemplated that we were to go through with the expenditure of \$75,000,000 for certain transmission lines and a steam plant, which, however, the testimony shows are an unnecessary Federal expenditure.

I think perhaps the clearest way to present the issue in the first instance is

to read to the Senate from the report of the House committee on this point. What we are doing here is attempting to restore two items to which the House committee critically referred and strongly objected. The language in the House committee report is found on page 18 of the report, in the following terms:

Central Valley project, California: In recommending a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the estimate of \$5,500,000 for the Central Valley project the committee has specifically disapproved items of \$115,300 for the Delta steam power plant (planning) and \$100,000 for transmission lines and switchyards (planning). It is the intention of the committee that none of the funds appropriated in the bill, or heretofore appropriated, shall be used for any purpose in connection with the establishment of a steam plant or a transmission system. The committee is advised that power now available from the project is being sold near the Shasta Dam under a contract which guarantees to the Government a fair and equitable price and which preserves for public agencies the preference they are entitled to under the reclamation law. Under these conditions it is unnecessary for the Government to appropriate funds to construct either a steam plant, estimated to cost \$26,000,000, or a transmission system which would cost approximately \$48,000,000, which would not produce greater returns to the Government. There is no unserved market in the area. The proposed steam plant and transmission system would duplicate if not destroy existing taxpaying facilities and take much valuable property off the tax rolls to the detriment of many towns and counties in the State of California.

In the case of the Central Valley project the committee wishes to point out that the estimated cost has risen in a few years from \$170,000,000 to over \$362,000,000.

The final sentences of the House report on this point read:

Considering the need for economy, it would appear to be to the interest of the project to find ways and means of reducing rather than increasing estimates. The committee recommends that the Bureau of Reclamation give careful consideration to this situation.

If we now turn to the testimony given before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, at page 864, we find there are four separate paragraphs which deal briefly with four separate points which I believe cover the issue adequately. First, as to the need for a steam plant—I may explain that this great Central Valley project extends through the center of California from the north to the south, about midway between the coast and the interior State line. The Shasta Dam, to which reference is made, is at the northern end of the project. The proposal is to build a 200-mile transmission line directly down through the territory now served by private interests, to place a steam plant just inland from San Francisco in order to firm that system and in order to help in the transmission of power to the irrigation system.

The principal arguments against this are that there already is an adequate private power development of that great area; that there are no new customers there; that there is plenty of power there, and that the local private power interests will buy all the power produced by the Government and transmit it on their lines and resell it to their users without

the necessity for the erection of additional power lines by the Government.

On the first point, the need for the steam plant, one brief paragraph in the testimony is as follows—and this is from the testimony of the president of the local power company, who says:

It is again claimed by the Bureau that the steam plant is required to "make firm" the output of the project's hydro plants. This is not so. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—

That is the local company—

has offered and continue to offer to pay for all hydroelectric power generated on the project a price equal to the value it would have if "firmed" by an independent steam plant. We have further offered and continue to offer to "make firm" any power which the Bureau may sell to public agencies and to do this at a cost no greater than if such power were made firm by a project steam plant.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been interested in the discussion by the Senator from Ohio. I realize that whether there is adequate supply of electric energy in an area or not depends largely on the price at which it is sold. Can the Senator tell us how the rates charged by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. compare with the rates charged to the users of Bonneville power or TVA power? What I am getting at is, if the rates were low enough would there be an adequate supply of power, or would there not? We can always hold the rates so high that there will be a surplus, or they can be put so low that there will always be a deficiency, as I see it. So I was wondering what the situation is in this case.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the testimony would indicate to me that there is no trouble with the rates being charged in that area, and that all the consumers who are seeking power obtain power. I refer to a quotation on page 872 of the record of the hearings, in which special reference is made to utility rates in that area. I quote from the report of the Railroad Commission of California for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, as follows:

San Francisco retains its position with lowest-cost utility services (combined gas, electric, and telephone) of any of the 25 major cities of the United States, and Los Angeles has the lowest of any city in the Nation with over 1,000,000 population.

That is under the same regulation, and the rural areas, I understand, throughout that section are fully served. But the point is that the private customer offers to buy from the Shasta Dam—the Government—whatever power the Government produces, at a rate to be fixed by the State Railroad Commission of California and the Federal Power Commission, and to transmit that power to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask for further information whether San Francisco and Los Angeles have municipal distributing plants?

Mr. BURTON. I am afraid I will have to refer that question to the junior Senator from California [Mr. Downey] for answer.



Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, Los Angeles largely does. San Francisco does not.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from California further advise me—if the Senator from Ohio will yield for that purpose?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As to how the rates in the area which will be served by the Central Valley project and which are now served by that project compare with the rates charged to users of Bonneville and TVA and other public power developments?

Mr. DOWNEY. I think that, generally speaking, the present electric rates in California are reasonably cheap compared to those elsewhere in the Nation. We think that one of the reasons therefor is that in the public-utility work of the city of Los Angeles we have had a most important yardstick by which to measure what are just and reasonable rates.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, therefore, on that first point, I wish clearly to bring out that, so far as there being need for a steam plant to firm the supply of power or to contribute firmness to the rates, the local company has offered and continues to offer to make firm any power which the Bureau may sell to public agencies, and to do so at a cost no greater than if such power were made firm by a Government project steam plant.

The second point: Is there a need for the transmission line? Here the testimony is clear. I summarize it, and then shall read it. The local company offers to take the power at the Shasta Dam and to deliver equivalent power at the other end of the system over its lines, of course allowing for line losses, without the necessity of building a new set of transmission lines by the Government down through the territory which the company is already serving.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the private utility took the power from the publicly constructed dam and passed it on to the consumers, it would pass on the saving, resulting from the construction of this dam with public money—we will say about \$10,000,000 a year—the company would pass that on, but would avoid the establishment of a yardstick in that area by so doing.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the issue, the rates charged by the company are not involved in the particular matter I am speaking of. The company is taking power from the dam and delivering power at the other end of its system. The only question is whether the company delivers the same power, after proper allowance is made for any loss en route. As the Senator points out, there is not a yardstick of rates established by the Government because there is one company already serving the whole area, and the justice of the rates depends on the stability of the Railroad Commission of California in fixing them. I may say that I have not heard a criticism of the rates as such or the work of the commission as such.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I to understand that the private company would distribute the power at prices to be fixed by the Federal Power Commission, or approved at least by the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. BURTON. The private company buys from the Government at rates which are approved by the Power Commission. When it sells, of course it must sell at retail subject to those rates. It operates under them directly.

Mr. AIKEN. Who approves the rates at which it would be sold to the private customer?

Mr. BURTON. The sale from the local power companies to the private consumer must be under the State commission, and the rate at which the United States Government sells to the power company at the other end is also indirectly under the local commission, because the commission only allows the company a credit for a reasonable price for the power it buys.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Federal Power Commission would have no control over retail rates?

Mr. BURTON. I think not.

Turning to the next paragraph on page 864 of the hearings, dealing with the need for the transmission line, I read again from the president of the local power company as follows:

It is also claimed that the proposed transmission system is required in order to bring the project's power output into the market and to make it available for pumping plants required in the Delta division of the project. This likewise is not so. The company has offered and continues to offer to buy all of the project's hydroelectric power at the company's Shasta substation, 25 miles below Shasta Dam. It has also offered to supply the project's pumping plants on an exchange basis with power from the company's transmission system, the company to be paid in power delivered to it at its Shasta substation. The pumping plants would be assured of a power supply at all times, irrespective of the operation of the project's power plants. The steam plant and transmission system are therefore not only unnecessary, but appropriations for their construction would be a waste of public funds.

The third point to which I wish to refer in the record is the question of the need of this income by the Government project. I read the following brief paragraph from the testimony:

The company is willing to make a long-term agreement or a short-term agreement for all hydroelectric power produced on the project, whichever the Bureau may deem to be to its best economic advantage. It is also willing to provide for the release from time to time of such quantities of power as the Bureau may wish to use itself or to sell to other buyers, including public agencies, as provided for in the reclamation law.

Finally, on the question of the need for service in the area, I quote the following paragraph:

The territory in which the project's hydroelectric energy must be used is already completely served by this company. The company's system is the natural outlet for the project's hydroelectric energy; in fact it is the only outlet, unless wasteful duplicating lines and other facilities are constructed in an endeavor to take away existing consumers or to compete with the company for new customers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to tire the Senator from Ohio, but I have one further question in regard to this project, as to which I know very little. That is why I am seeking information.

If the power from the Central Valley project were sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., would the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have a virtual monopoly on the electric energy for that part of California. I do not know whether it operates in all of California, but would the result be to give this one company a virtual monopoly?

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the situation—and the Senator from California will correct me if I am mistaken—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. already has a substantial monopoly in that area. This would merely mean the continuance of its existing situation, with additional sources of supply. If the power were supplied directly by the Government, there would be duplication of the existing supply system.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would continue to enjoy a monopoly, under regulation, would it not?

Mr. BURTON. It would continue it; yes.

Mr. President, I have no brief for the local company. I have no interest to serve in this matter except those of the public and I agree entirely with the House of Representatives that this is a case in which it appears that \$75,000,000 may well be saved by the United States Government, and reliance may well be placed upon the local concern to supply the power, the transmission lines, and the plants needed. I therefore object to the adoption of the committee amendment providing for the planning of this expenditure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in the first place, I think it might be well for the Senate to know that, so far as I am advised, the only substantial opposition to these two comparatively small items of appropriation comes from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which, as has been very frankly stated on the floor of the Senate, at the present time enjoys a virtual monopoly on the production and distribution of electric energy in the great area of northern California.

I have no criticism of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in its opposition to these items of appropriation. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is a very able, powerful, and wealthy electric and gas utility. I may add, in all candor and fairness, that it is very potent in the political affairs of the State of California.

That company was represented before the congressional committees by a Mr. Black, president of the company, a most persuasive, eloquent, and able man, who undoubtedly was looking to the profits of his company. Beyond any doubt, if ultimately all of this power is sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., it will legally and rightfully be entitled to a profit upon the electric energy which it buys from the United States Government and thereafter sells to consumers in the State of California.

Mr. President, I do not make any criticism of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s being here and properly presenting its views to the Congress of the United States; but I think that the fact the only important opposition to these items is from the company which now has, and will continue to have, a monopoly of electric energy in the area in what it operates is of relevancy and importance.

I believe that the whole situation is more complicated and difficult than was expressed in the findings and the testimony read by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. The county of Sacramento lies about 100 miles down the Sacramento River from the great Shasta Dam, where this power is to be generated. About 5 years ago the people of that great county, a fine agricultural section, decided to form a municipal utility district for the purpose of taking over the retail distributing system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. After long years of most difficult and arduous litigation, after hearings before the California State Railroad Commission, and many appeals to appellate courts, judgment of condemnation was given in the lower court, fixing the damages, for the delivery of the retail distributing system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the public agency of the citizens of the county of Sacramento. In all candor, I may say that it happens that my brother, with whom I was formerly associated in the practice of law, was and is the attorney representing the Sacramento municipal utility district.

However, litigation is not finally concluded. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has taken an appeal from this final judgment to the Supreme Court of the State of California. The question now being considered by the courts there is how and when, and under what circumstances, pending the appeal, the utility district of the county of Sacramento should take over this property and pay the price fixed by the court.

The point I desire to make is this: At the present time there is great uncertainty in the minds of those who are operating the utility district in Sacramento County as to the conditions under which they should purchase power to carry on the retail electrical business in the county of Sacramento. As I have said, from now on this utility district will be expected to take a substantial part of the electric energy which will be produced at the Shasta Dam. It may very well be that ultimately the best arrangement that can be worked out will be through the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. However, it would be most unfortunate for the United States Government at this time virtually to serve notice upon the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and upon the people of the State of California that the Congress of the United States is officially taking the position that it will not proceed with completion of the surveys for the transmission line, by virtue of which the Government could sell power directly to the people of Sacramento County and to great reclamation and farm agencies which will want this power, principally for pumping water from the Sacramento River over into the San Joaquin River.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us what the productive capacity of the Central Valley project will be? How much power will it produce?

Mr. DOWNEY. I think the power presently provided for is about 200,000 kilowatts.

Mr. HAYDEN. The firm power that may be generated at Shasta Dam amounts to 200,000 kilowatts. It could be firmed up by a steam plant to between 350,000 and 400,000 kilowatts. The farm use, that is, the pumping use, to which the Senator referred, requires 120,000 kilowatts, to pump water out of the Sacramento River drainage over into the San Joaquin.

Mr. AIKEN. How many kilowatt-hours annually would that amount to?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is stated in the record that the expected output at Shasta for the calendar year 1945 will be in excess of 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that kilowatt-hours?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a billion kilowatt-hours.

Mr. AIKEN. A billion?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; a billion kilowatt-hours. It is a very large development.

Mr. AIKEN. What percentage of that would be used in pumping water and what percentage would be available for use by customers?

Mr. HAYDEN. Figuring it the other way, I have stated that of the 200,000 kilowatts of firm power, without any firming up, 120,000 kilowatts must be used for pumping. If it is firmed up, there will be that much more to sell to the municipalities and to others to help pay the cost of the project.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know how much power California now uses, annually?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot say, although it uses all that is produced by the Boulder Dam project and all that is produced by the other dams which are in existence. There is no question about the market for power, because the country is growing and expanding.

Mr. AIKEN. The market depends on the price. Of course, there is no doubt that all the power which will be produced anywhere will be used.

Mr. HAYDEN. This much I can say—and I am sure I am correct—that the price for power in Portland and Seattle, where the power comes from Bonneville and Grand Coulee, is less than it is in San Francisco, and the price at Los Angeles is also less, on the average. There is not quite so much difference between the prices in the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas which are served by this company as there is between the prices in the Los Angeles and the Portland and Seattle areas, where the power comes from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee developments.

Mr. AIKEN. Where does San Francisco get its power?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say first that a large part of the power now used by the city of Los Angeles comes from the Boulder Dam hydroelectric plant.

Mr. AIKEN. Does Los Angeles buy that power from the Government?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does not control the power from Boulder Dam, does it?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does not operate in southern California. A parallel corporation, the Southern California Edison, operates there; and it buys some of the power at wholesale from Shasta Dam.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the city of Los Angeles has the lowest rates of any large city having a population of a million or more?

Mr. DOWNEY. I believe that to be true. The Los Angeles Light & Power Co., a municipal agency, buys power directly from the Boulder Dam project.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us how many farmers will be affected?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should think that in the area which will be covered by this power distribution probably 30,000 farms will be affected.

Mr. LANGER. At the present time in that locality there is no Rural Electrification Administration development at all; is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; there is one small Rural Electrification Administration cooperative in the State of California, but it is not in this area.

Mr. LANGER. So, as I understand the situation, the Government would not be duplicating a system which has already been established there by the corporation; is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does have facilities over this general area; but in view of the development which will come from this power, I do not think there will be any excess facilities constructed, if the Government goes ahead with this program. In other words, all the facilities which would be constructed under this ultimate program would be necessary and would have to be constructed either by a private corporation or by the Government.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, then, 30,000 farmers who today do not have power will be able to get it if the amendment is adopted; is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I would not quite say that. Many of the farmers now have power, but additional power will be needed for farmers because of this great project which is under way.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What would be the principal advantages entailed in having the Government have the right to build this transmission line and to put in a steam plant? Would it mean that more people would be served or that they would be better served or that they would be served at lower rates; or what would be the advantage?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that no contract has as yet been negotiated with the Pacific Gas & Electric



Co., for instance, for the area at Sacramento City or for the area where it will be necessary to pump the water. None of us know at this time what will be the contract which should be negotiated either between the Government and these public agencies or between the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and these public agencies. I am advised that the power which presently exists will, in terms of money, be worth approximately \$10,000,000 a year within the next 2 or 3 years. Looking ahead, the power which may be generated from similar hydro-electric projects in this area may be worth \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000.

Here we have involved two items totaling \$215,000. Until the two surveys are completed—the survey for the transmission line and the survey for the auxiliary steam plant to firm up the hydroelectric power—I do not think any of us is in a position to judge what would be the best arrangement which could be made for the people of the State of California.

These two items would represent a cost of approximately 2 percent of the value of this electric energy in 1 year. It seems to me to be most unfortunate that the Senate by rejecting these items would virtually serve notice upon everyone concerned that Congress is not going to allow the Government to build the transmission line and the auxiliary plant, in any event.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The question I wished to ask in order to clear up the situation or to have the Record made clear was the one raised by the Senators from North Dakota and Vermont, because I am as deeply interested as they are in providing service for the rural areas and also in completing the Central Valley project and in its success. The issue before the Senate, as I have seen it and as I heard it in the committee, is not whether one method would result in providing more power for farmers or whether one method rather than the other would enable the transmission line to be completed, but, rather, which lines the power would go over, whether private lines or Government lines. In either event the same number of farmers would be served and the same service would result. The question is really one of mechanics within the system, not one of the system itself.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I cannot entirely agree that that is an accurate statement, and later I shall point out why I do not think it is.

But first I yield to the Senator from New Mexico, who, I understand, wishes to be recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California a question. Suppose the Government never builds the transmission line or the steam auxiliary plant, would the effect then be to freeze the monopoly which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. now has in that section?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think that question can be very directly answered in the affirmative. It would forever give a monopoly of the distribution

and sale of this power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator is making his argument on the ground that he wants the people of the United States to spend \$75,000,000 on local power projects in that section in order to prevent a local company from maintaining the monopoly it already has? Is that the business we are to be in?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not think there is a meeting of the minds between the Senator from Ohio and me. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] asked me this question, as I understood: If we were never to build this transmission line and the auxiliary plant, would the result be that we would forever give a monopoly of the purchase of this electric energy to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.? I answered that question in the affirmative; I said it would do that.

What conclusion did the Senator from Ohio draw from that?

Mr. BURTON. Then it seemed to me that the next step which was in the Senator's mind was that, therefore, we should spend the \$75,000,000 so as to break into that monopoly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senate is not today or this year confronted with the ultimate decision whether we should build a transmission line and a steam plant. The only thing which is before the Senate today is the question whether we should complete surveys, which are already 50 percent, or two-thirds completed; and whether we should finish them, so that we will know where to go forward from there.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has very generously said that it will buy this electric power at just as high a figure as the Government can sell it elsewhere directly to any public agency. Of course, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. can safely make such an offer, because if it once buys the power and pays for it, and the people want the power, the State railroad commission, in fixing the price at retail, will, of course, allow the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to recapture whatever amount of money it has paid for the power. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will be in the very happy position of being in the middle and will be able to buy this public power at whatever contract figure shall be agreed upon. The California State Railroad Commission will then allow the company to recapture the money which it has paid in the retail price which is fixed, plus whatever shall be agreed upon between the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the State railroad commission as a reasonable price, which, of course, will be an extraordinary sum, and which will represent a very fat contract for the utility company.

Mr. President, I am not saying that when all these plans are completed what I have stated would be the best way to work the problem out in northern California; but I believe that we would be surrendering a most valuable bargaining point if Congress were now to declare that it will make sure that the Pa-

cific Gas & Electric Co. shall have a monopoly upon the power, even before the bargains are made, or before any order has been issued by the State railroad commission.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we can properly evaluate this whole situation until the surveys of the transmission lines shall have been completed and we know what they will be in extent, amount, and cost. I believe the same to be true in respect to the auxiliary plants. As I have already said, the surveys have been more than half completed, and more than half of the allotted funds have been spent. Now we are being asked to stop those surveys before completion, and give assurance to the great Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that it will not be interfered with in any bargain which it may wish to undertake.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from California has stated that the Federal Government should provide the sum of \$75,000,000, or whatever it may be, in order to establish a competitive agent in the locality under consideration, and enable the Government perhaps to sell the power more cheaply to the people of California, and that then the people of California, the users of the power, would pay a return on private capital which had been invested in order to serve them. In most places throughout the country it is true, and properly so, that the consumers of electric power pay a fair return upon the capital which has been invested for their use, and do so under the regulation of the local railroad or power commission, or whatever the name of the agency of that character may be. The local company must pay taxes, and so forth.

What seems extraordinary to me is that we are being asked to take out of the United States Treasury the sum of \$75,000,000 and invest it in California where the users may obtain electric power more cheaply than they could obtain it from private capital invested in the normal and usual manner. I do not believe that to be the best public policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Reserving the right to answer the argument of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. One might easily derive the impression from the remarks of the Senator from Ohio that this sum of \$75,000,000 is to be a gift to someone. Is that true, or is the project to be a self-liquidating one? Is the Government going to produce the power and give it to California, or will it make a charge to the people of California for the power which they use? If the latter is true, would not the \$75,000,000 eventually come back to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, under the reclamation law now on the statute books the principal of all investments must be repaid to the Government. The Government subsidizes a project by waiving any interest but repayment of the

principal is generally amortized over a period of 40 years.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand it, the sum proposed to be appropriated would be paid back to the people of the United States without interest over 40 or 50 years at the rate of 2 percent a year. Mr. President, that comes very close to being a gift.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] was much more fortunate in getting Congress to agree to what was a very righteous cause in behalf of the people of the South, because under the TVA Act the \$700,000,000 or \$800,000,000 which was appropriated to build that great TVA project does not have to be repaid either in principal or interest. On the other hand, the reclamation projects in the West generally are required to pay interest. Under the equally great Boulder Dam project, which the senior Senator from California [Mr. Johnson] helped to secure for the great southwest, the people in that territory not only must repay the principal, but likewise must pay interest on the use of the money. However, Mr. President, I want the distinguished Senator from Ohio to know that we in California are not responsible for the present reclamation law. It is upon the statute books. It is the statute under which the project to which I have referred was built, and the Congress, in its wisdom, saw fit to provide that with regard to Reclamation Bureau projects the principal amount invested by the Government must be amortized and repaid.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from California in recognizing that the reclamation law is an act of Congress. I support it thoroughly, and I believe in it. I think it is worth while. I think it has proved to be a valuable factor in connection with the development of our West. However, I object to carrying the irrigation program into a separate power project when already private capital is serving the area involved.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks—and I am about ready to do so—I desire to repeat to the Members of the Senate that the issue is not as recently stated by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, namely, whether the Congress should appropriate \$75,000,000 for auxiliary plants and transmission lines. The issue is whether at the present time the Congress of the United States should appropriate an additional \$215,000 to complete surveys for this enterprise so that the Congress and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the interested persons, may form their own conclusions as to how the electric energy, which will amount in value to \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 a year, should be disposed of. From my own point of view, and speaking for the people of northern California, I would say that it would be most unfortunate at this time for the Congress officially to take the position that it will not even proceed with the completion of these surveys, but will do away with all bargaining power which would inure to the people of California in their dealings with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I am about to ask my last question. If we appropriate \$115,300 for planning of the Delta steam power plant, and \$100,000 for planning of transmission lines, it will not necessarily mean that the steam plant will be built, or that the transmission lines will be built, or that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will not be the principal customer for the power produced. As I understand, the language in the bill provides for investigation and planning only, after which the Congress must act in making an appropriation for the steam power plant or the transmission lines before they may be constructed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is correct. When these plans shall have been perfected by virtue of the proposed appropriation, the whole matter will have to be given most careful consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I am happy to yield to one of its distinguished members, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this item is either good or bad. We should vote for it with our eyes open. Investigation as to whether or not we shall build the firm power plant, the steam plant, and the other plant, is being made by those who want the project to proceed. Let us not quibble about these things in the Senate. Either this project is good or it is not. Let us not say that if we give them \$117,000,000 we might build it, because the people who are making the investigation are the ones who want to do the building, and there is nothing to it. If we give them the money, they are going to decide whether they should build the power plant. Let us do it with our eyes open. If it is good, let us do it; if it is not, let us not do it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I have heard the testimony in the hearings on this issue for the past several years. It came before the Congress in connection with the last Interior Department appropriation bill. Practically the same arguments were made for and against the item last year. The House eliminated it from the bill; it came to the Senate, and hearings were held. In the Senate committee I voted against the item. The House conferees refused to accept it last year, and the money was not made available. This year the proponents of the project asked for money with which to make the surveys, \$115,000 to make the survey for the Delta steam power plant, and \$100,000 to make a survey and plans for the transmission line.

The other body refused to make the appropriation to cover these surveys and engineering works. When the matter came to the Senate the subcommittee heard the testimony, and as I recall by a substantial majority refused to recommend the item to the main committee. In the main committee it was taken up again, and by a slight majority was ordered placed in the bill.

Mr. President, this issue is not a local one. Were it a local issue, I should be disposed to follow the recommendation of the distinguished Senator from California. But there is involved a question of national policy. We are called upon, not to appropriate \$115,000 to make plans for a steam plant, not to make an appropriation of \$100,000 to make plans for a transmission line, but we are called upon to establish and set forth a national policy with respect to the generation and distribution of electricity.

The same issue has come before the United States engineers in developing flood-control works. In building great dams, they have, as an incident to their flood-control work, the development of power. So the issue there arises in connection with such construction; but, so far as I know, the Engineers have never requested money with which to build a transmission line and a distributing system. The Engineers are content to build the dams, to build the power plants, to develop the energy, and then sell the energy at the dam, at the bus bar.

My State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas are separated only by the Red River. Congress has authorized the expenditure of approximately \$55,000,000 in the building of a giant hydroelectric plant at Denison, a town in Texas near the dam from which the dam took the name of Denison. It is on the Red River. This dam was constructed to create a reservoir in order to control floodwaters in the Red River, and eventually to control floods in the Mississippi, but as an incident of controlling floods, there was a power development. It is not a large power development, but still it is a power development. The engineers have decided, as the best policy, to sell the power at the dam. They have entered into a contract with two of the large power concerns in the area to sell the power generated at the Denison Dam to the private companies, and the private companies build their own transmission lines to the dam, take all the power, and distribute it.

In times when there is plenty of water, the maximum power is available. The private companies take all the power at high-water time, and when the power becomes low, as it does, and as it will continue to do, then they draw on the steam-generating facilities to supply their customers. But through this contract they take all the power, not only the prime power, but what is called the dump power, and they pay a good price for it.

It is the contention of the Engineers, I understand, that they can obtain more money for the sale of all their power, not only prime power, but the dump power, than they can obtain by selling merely what might be termed the prime power, or the power they can deliver 365 days in the year.

Mr. President, the Shasta Dam was started on an estimate of about \$160,000,000 or \$170,000,000. It was initiated as a reclamation proposition. We all voted for it, I think, when it was proposed; at least, I did. I was for the project then, and I am for it now; as an irrigation project. The law which authorized the creation of the Shasta Dam



provided that power should be generated as an incident to reclamation, and that such power should be disposed of, which made it a good business proposition. The project has developed until it is now a \$362,000,000 proposition. A comparatively small project involving \$160,000,000 has grown in the space of 2 years to a \$362,000,000 project, including, of course, the steam plant and the transmission lines.

We have here an issue not only of \$115,000 with which to make plans for a steam plant, not only an issue of \$100,000 with which to make plans for transmission lines; but one involving an element of national policy, and the Congress must decide the policy. If it were a matter of only \$115,000, I suppose it would be too small to talk about. In the section of the country from which I come the people are under the impression that nowadays that if a project does not contemplate the expenditure of a billion dollars, Congress has no time for it.

This project started on a small scale. That is the way smart people bring about legislative results. A camel, in order to get under the tent, must first get his nose under. Later he gets his head under. He keeps moving, as smart camels do, and eventually he gets his hump under, and in time the camel is under the tent. The first thing legislators learn when they come to a legislative body is to start on a small scale. That is the way a building is raised. That is the way a stump is removed from the ground. It is raised by elevating it half an inch or an inch, then putting a check under it, getting a good hold, and lifting a little bit more. Senators from the timber sections of the country know what I am talking about.

Mr. President, the proposal before the Senate is not merely the appropriation of \$115,000 and \$100,000; but the issue involves approximately \$75,000,000 for the building of a gigantic steam plant and the building of a transmission line to carry electricity from the Shasta Dam and the Keswick Dam to wherever the power can be sold.

Mr. President, I am against the policy that is sought to be established of having the Bureau of Reclamation become a Shasta Dam Authority for Central California. I am not against Central California; I am for it. I want the people there to have irrigation, and they have it. But I am opposed to Congress in effect creating a Shasta Dam Authority, and making that authority consist of the personnel of the Bureau of Reclamation. That is exactly what is pending before the Senate at this hour.

The proponents of this proposal do not want to stop merely with the building of a transmission line; they do not want to stop with the building of a power plant. If they get the transmission line and the power plant and firm up their power they will have power to sell. They have no power to sell from the Shasta Dam at the present time; they have some dump power at times of high water, but there will not be high water there at all times. It is said a plant is only good to the extent of its productive capacity, and if such capacity is 50,000 kilowatts at low-

water time, that is all the power the plant can sell with assurance. So, in order to get a lot of power, so as to enable them to go into the power business, the proponents of the project want to take the power from the Shasta Dam and the Keswick Dam and then build an enormous steam plant, to be kept in a standby condition, so that when the water recedes in the two dams they can fire the steam plant and bring up the prime power to the extent of their contracts to sell.

One witness came before the committee and suggested that the way to firm the power from the Shasta Dam and the Keswick Dam was to build more hydroelectric plants. Anyone who is at all familiar with the subject knows that if two additional hydroelectric plants are built to firm up the power from the Shasta and Keswick plants, then it will be necessary to build more hydroelectric plants to firm up the power from the plants so built. Thus it would be an unending proposition, and it is not feasible.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this matter which appeals to me, and that is the taxation feature. When the war is over I fear we are going to have a national debt of around \$300,000,000,000. It may be more; I hope it will not be. If the national debt is only \$300,000,000,000, at 2½ percent interest, making the computation of the interest charge, it follows that seven and one-half billion dollars must be raised in taxes each year in order to meet the interest on the national debt. That is item No. 1.

Item No. 2. For some time at least we must support a large military establishment. No one can tell how many men the Government will have to support in that establishment. We must have a large Navy. We must retain a large Army ground force. We must retain a large air force. It is my judgment from what I know, drawing on knowledge gained from my association with military authorities, that we will have to maintain a military establishment composed of a Navy and an Army and Air Corps at a cost of more than \$5,000,000,000 a year for an indefinite period to come.

At the present time we do not dare to scrap our Navy as we did 25 years ago. We do not dare to scrap our Air Force, as we might do. We do not dare to discharge our ground forces down to 113,000 men, as we did after World War I. Until the world becomes rational again, until order is restored in Europe and in other parts of the world, I do not think the interests of America will be served unless we maintain a military force sufficiently large and well equipped to protect our interests everywhere. How long it will be necessary I cannot tell; but I am afraid that the necessity for it will not end in the immediate future.

So, \$7,500,000,000 will be the annual interest rate on the national debt. Five billion dollars a year at least will be necessary for the Military Establishment. Senators may make their own computation.

Then we must take care of the returning soldiers. They must be hospitalized. They must receive education, as we have promised them. We must make them

loans, as we have promised to do. These expenses are incident to the present war, and they will total in excess of \$15,000,000,000 annually for years to come.

I have not as yet touched the regular expenses of the National Government. Fifteen billion dollars a year must be provided by reason of World War II, for the immediate future, and as far as I can see in the future. Then we must take care of the soldiers of World War I, that as yet costs a gigantic sum. Pensions will be coming along in a little while, and they will make a terrific drain on the Federal Treasury.

It is my forecast, Mr. President, that the American people will have to raise approximately \$25,000,000,000 a year in taxes from this time henceforth in order to meet the running expenses of the Nation. If I am correct it will take many taxes to raise \$25,000,000,000 a year. If the Congress begins to destroy taxpaying property, where are we going to get the needed revenue?

A few years ago the Reclamation Bureau asked for money to build a transmission line in connection with the Shasta project. The Congress did not appropriate the money. The Congress went on record for the time being as being opposed to the building of this line. Yet, the Bureau of Reclamation went ahead and built the line at an expense of one and one-half million dollars. I say the Bureau built it without authority of law and in contravention of the express orders of the Congress of the United States. When the Reclamation Bureau had built this line, costing one and a half million dollars, it leased or rented the line to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for \$75,000 a year. It is now a publicly owned transmission line on which no taxes are paid. The company would have built the line; indeed the company agreed to build it; but the Government would not permit them to build a private line. It insisted on building its own line, and by that act not only used one and one-half million dollars of the taxpayers' money without authority of law, as I believe, but on the line thus built no taxes are collected, thus cheating the counties and the State of California of a considerable sum each year in taxes.

Mr. President, the San Francisco Bay area is an important section of California. It is an important section of the United States. It is growing rapidly. It will continue to grow rapidly. There has been no complaint to date that the local company has not furnished all the power that the citizens living in that area have requested, or even that the Government of the United States has requested. The company has served all the demands made upon it. There has been no complaint made before the committee that this private company has not furnished all the power that was wanted for the war effort, and for the cities and for the rural districts.

It is stated here on the floor, or the inference might have been left, that the farmers in that section were without electrical energy. Mr. President, the evidence does not sustain that contention. The evidence is that there are only one or two rural electrification co-

operatives in that area. The reason there are no more cooperatives there is because this local company has served and is serving the farmers. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has already created a gigantic REA covering that whole area, and I am advised that every farmer, unless he lives in a very isolated district, either has electrical current connected with his home or farm, or can obtain it by making application for it. So this plant is not needed to serve the city of San Francisco and other cities surrounding it and it is not needed to serve the farmers in that area, because they are served now.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Is there any complaint that the rates being charged by the private power company are unreasonable or exorbitant?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I attended, I think, all the meetings held by the subcommittee when this issue was raised last year and this year. There was no complaint made from any source that there was a shortage of power in that area. That is the first proposition.

The second is that there has been no complaint from any source that the rates were too high. So we are permitted to conclude that the company has the power needed, and it is being distributed at a reasonable charge. I understand the rates are fixed by the Railroad Commission of California. Naturally, therefore, if they were too high, resort could be had to that organization on an application to have the rates reduced. So far as I know no applications are pending, but I am not advised concerning that.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to address one other question to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the line proposed to be built at Government expense be competitive with the existing line of the private utility?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes, indeed. It is proposed to start at these two dams and build transmission lines as far as necessary in order to distribute the electrical current generated there, and to build a gigantic power plant, and have it stand idly by in high-water times, so that it can be available when water is low, to generate steam power to firm up the waning power of the hydroelectric plant.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, even if the Congress desired to start out to destroy property, or to build competing lines upon which no taxes are paid, I think now is the wrong time to begin such a policy. I think the Congress should be looking for places to obtain revenue instead of places to get rid of revenue. If the proposed transmission line and the proposed surveys are provided for that will be authority for the Reclamation Bureau to come forward next year and say, "We want \$10,000,000, \$15,000,000, or \$20,000,000 to start the lines and to start the building of the power plant." This is the enter-

ing wedge; if the Senate wants to go on record as desiring to have the United States put the Reclamation Bureau into the business of power development and distribution, then this is the way to go about it. They have not started it as yet to any considerable extent. At Boulder Canyon Dam, one of the largest in the country, the power is generated by the Government. But the power is sold at the bus bar, which means at the dam itself. I am advised that the Government has not a dollar invested in any transmission line taking power from Boulder Dam. Private power companies have built their own transmission lines to Boulder Dam. A private power company can obtain a permit to build a line to Boulder Dam and then take the power under contract. That is the policy which I favor. Under that system taxes are paid locally on the transmission line. Taxes are paid to the State, and to the Federal Government. If the proposed transmission line is built, it will be nontaxable. If the power plant is built, it will be nontaxable. It will be in competition with the private concern which is now serving the area.

I know only one person connected with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. He is Mr. Black, who, I believe, is the president. He appeared before our committee last year and testified; and he appeared again this year. The information which I have is gathered from the hearings of last year and this year.

So, Mr. President, if the proposed transmission line is built, and the power plant is built, the Reclamation Bureau will be embarking upon a gigantic electrical energy development program, including distribution, not alone to cities, but to the people generally in the area. It will not stop with selling power to Sacramento City. It will not stop with selling power to the gas and electric company, or to the city of Oakland, or some other city. It has in mind not only building the transmission line and the power plant, but also building distributing lines to distribute the power throughout the cities in that area.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to have the Senator's authority for his last statement, because it is directly contradicted by the head of the Reclamation Bureau. The Reclamation Bureau never has engaged in that sort of activity since it was founded. How does the Senator know that the Reclamation Bureau plans to go into the local distribution of power? He is following a process of reasoning; but I am sure he has no basis of fact upon which to make that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I believe the Senator is correct so far as the record is concerned. So far as the record is concerned, the Bureau of Reclamation has not been so bold as to go to that extent. However, if the proposed transmission line and power plant were built, the Reclamation Service would have a vast power-generating system with no place to sell the power. What would it do with the power?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would not the private power company be glad to buy it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Suppose it were not?

Mr. HILL. That is the very point. If it were not, we ought to have the transmission line, so that we should not be at the mercy of any private power company.

I saw the Government of the United States spend millions of dollars to build Wilson Dam during the last war. Then I saw the Government stand absolutely at the mercy of the private power companies in that area. Power went to waste over the dam, and the Government was unable to sell it because there was no Government transmission line there, and the private power companies either would not buy the power, or would not buy it at the price which the Government considered fair. The fact is that the power which was sold to private power companies at that time went to the private power companies for a mere song, and was resold to consumers in that area at a huge profit.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. We must keep the record straight. Wilson Dam was not completed during World War I. It stood for years half-completed, and not a kilowatt of power could be generated, because there was no power-generating machinery, save in the Gorgas Steam Plant.

Mr. HILL. The truth is that the Wilson Dam was started during the last war. It was not completed until after the war. It did remain uncompleted for about a year; but it was completed long before the Government established the TVA and went into the sale of power. For month after month and year after year huge blocks of that power went to waste over the dam. Other blocks of it were sold, as I have said, for a mere song, to private power companies, and then resold by the private power companies to consumers at a huge profit.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the record shows that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has offered to make a contract with the Government to take all the power—not merely the prime power, but all the power, including power generated in times of low water, power generated in times of half-high water, and power generated in times of dam overflow, which is called dump power. It will take all the power.

It is the contention of those who are opposed to this amendment that the Government could obtain more money by selling all the power. First, it would save the expense of the survey, and then it would save the cost of building the transmission line and the power plant. It would save \$75,000,000. It is the contention of those who claim to know, that the Government can sell all the power, including both the prime power and dump power, and obtain millions of dollars more for it than it could obtain by building the transmission line and building a steam power plant, and then finding a market for the electricity.

We have before us the offer of a contract to take all the power, prime power and dump power, over a period of 25



years. The Government would receive more money than it could possibly obtain—if the testimony is to be relied upon—if it were to build a transmission line and power plant, and then find an outlet for all the power it could provide. It could sell only what it could reasonably depend upon from the hydroelectric power facilities and the steam plant. Under the other plan, it could sell all the power, much of which would otherwise go to waste over the dam.

Mr. President, this amendment is only the beginning. If the amendment is adopted and the House conferees agree to it, and the money is made available, the plans will be made. Then next year at this time there will be requests before the Congress for sums ranging from \$10,000,000 to \$25,000,000 with which to start construction of the steam power plant and the transmission line. At present prices, the cost would be \$65,000,000 or \$70,000,000.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. If we appropriate this \$115,000, will not the Bureau of Reclamation, of which the Senator is afraid, have to come to Congress for further appropriations?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; but if the Congress goes on record as approving this proposal, next year the Bureau of Reclamation will say, "Last year you gave us the money to make a survey. You would not have done it if you had not expected us to go ahead and make the plans."

Mr. GUFFEY. I think it is reasonable to make a survey. The survey ought to be made. The cost of the survey is a small item compared with the total cost. When I operated utilities I had surveys made to estimate the cost of various projects.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is all right, if the Congress decides to build the power plant.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not believe that construction of the transmission line would mean that the Government would be going into the utility business. I believe that if the Government were to build the power line, the consumers would obtain lower rates than if the Government were not to build it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that raises the issue raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. If it is good business to appropriate money to obtain a lower power rate for San Francisco and the bay area, when there is no complaint about the rates, then it certainly would be good business to make a survey on the Potomac and start construction, or talk about the construction of a number of power plants on the upper Potomac, in order to get lower rates in the District of Columbia. It would be good policy to revive a proposal in Maine for the development of power, to obtain cheaper power all along the Atlantic coast. If we were to follow that reasoning, where would it lead us? We would be appropriating money to develop facilities to obtain lower rates for every conceivable kind of project in the United States. We would even be building competing railroads to hold down railroad

rates. We would be building power plants to bring power rates down. I contend, Mr. President, that that is not the proper way for the Congress of the United States to proceed. I am against this amendment, and I hope the amendment will not be approved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the Senator is logical in what he says. He says that if we were to make this appropriation to complete the surveys and lay plans for the transmission line and the steam plant, the next logical step would be perhaps to investigate the possibilities of power production on the Potomac River, or in Maine, or some other State.

As I see it, in this case the Government is carrying out a Federal function. It is carrying out a program which we adopted some years ago, in connection with irrigation. When the Government builds a dam to carry out a function which has undertaken, and power is developed incidentally, we should make sure that such power goes to the consumers in the particular area at a fair and reasonable price, and that the Government is not placed at the mercy of a private power company in the sale and distribution of the power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At this time we have assurances that the local company will contract with the Government to take all the power for 25 years to come, at a rate to be agreed upon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator said, "At a rate to be agreed upon." There is a vast difference between a rate to be agreed upon and a definite rate which has been agreed upon. If the Congress of the United States, should it see fit to do so, votes down this proposal to complete these plans for a transmission line and the plans for a steam plant, then we will find that it will be far more difficult, in my opinion, to get fair and reasonable rates from the private power company than it would be if we were to go forward with these plans.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this matter is not going to be decided this afternoon. If the amendment should be voted down, the offer of this company will continue to stand. It will be there for the consideration of the Government, and it will still stand, unless it is withdrawn. In case it is withdrawn, then probably my opinion would change. But as it now stands, I can see no use in appropriating \$70,000,000 to build facilities for the sale of power, when the evidence shows that the Government can get more money without building the facilities than it could if the facilities were constructed.

Mr. President, take the case of the District of Columbia. The Congress could appropriate \$70,000,000 to have a series of dams built on the upper Potomac River at the public expense. Then we would say to the electric company in Washington, "If you do not reduce your rates, we will build lines to compete with you." Of course, if we built the dams, we would have to build the lines, in order

to compete. But with the expenditure of the public's money we could sell the power at any price we might see fit. If we tax the people to pay the bill, we can sell the power at whatever we can get for it—one mill or two mills a kilowatt. But private concerns could not compete in that event.

By legislation similar to this, proposing surveys for the building of hydroelectric plants and plans for building transmission lines and plans for building stand-by steam plants, we probably could reduce the rates in the District of Columbia, and that would affect all our pocketbooks and it would reduce the amount of all the checks for power paid by private consumers the first of each month. But who would be in favor of it? Not I.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield again?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has again, in my opinion, gone far afield, when he has talked about building dams to reduce the cost of power in the District of Columbia. That question is not involved here. The question here is one involving the position of the Government after it has built a dam to carry out a Federal function, and when power is incidentally generated at the dam. The question is whether the Government will make sure that the power which is generated will go to consumers in that area at a fair and reasonable price or whether the Government will be protected in seeing that the power does go to consumers at a fair and reasonable price.

If the Senator will yield further to me, let me say that the question of power rates is one as to which we cannot consider only the matter of price. We remember when many of the public utilities had all kinds of watered stock, and the people of the United States were paying rates for power based on that watered stock.

What we seek to do is to make sure that in consuming areas where the Government has built a dam the public will get the benefit of the power at fair and reasonable rates.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, power is now being generated at this plant, and is being sold. Every kilowatt of power that is being generated at the Shasta Dam is now being sold, so far as I know. We have not spent any money for a transmission line; we have spent no money for a power plant; but still we are selling the power as fast as we can develop it, and the situation is such that as more power is developed at that plant it can be sold. The offer is standing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas, who first requested me to yield, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was interested in the statement made a moment ago regarding taxes and the loss of taxes incident to the cessation of operations by the private distributing com-

pany. I have been told by those who know about the Tennessee Valley Authority and are interested in it that it is true that the taxes paid by the private power company which was displaced have been lost, but that in its place a great many private enterprises have grown up, and that the taxes they pay more than replace the taxes formerly paid by the private power company, and now lost. I should like to know whether the Senator believes that to be a sound argument.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, no doubt it is true that to that extent private industries have been built up because of the power. The Tennessee Valley Authority Act provides that a certain percentage of the gross income from the sale of power shall be used to reimburse local towns, cities, and the State itself for losses of taxes. I realize that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Aside from the initial loss of local taxes, for which reimbursement is made, I understand that the projects do not pay Federal income taxes. That point, in particular, interested me. I am told that there has been such a growth of purely private enterprises as a result of the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority that the taxes such enterprises pay much more than offset all the taxes the power companies used to pay. Does the Senator think that is true?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. To the extent that such private companies have gone into that territory, that is true. To that extent I am able to advise the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will now yield to me, I should like to state that so far as the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned, it pays taxes to the State, the counties, and the cities, and those taxes are fixed on the basis that the State and counties and cities should be paid taxes. That is provided for in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. The argument as to loss of taxes was made against the TVA bill when it was before the Congress, and one of the greatest fights I ever was in was to secure the enactment of a provision that the Tennessee Valley Authority, when organized, would have to pay taxes. There was quite a fight about that. We finally won that fight; and the TVA pays taxes, just as any other private company does. The same could be done with respect to the project involved in the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think that situation should be clarified. The TVA do not pay a Federal income tax; they do not pay a State income tax. They pay a certain percentage of their gross revenues to the State, on the basis of some sort of a formula which is fixed in the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. The payment is made to the State, the counties, and the cities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will further yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee about Federal income taxes. What is the Senator's belief about the effect on such taxes in the valley of the Tennessee by the creation of new private enterprises which do pay Federal

income taxes? Has there been any substantial increase?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; they have been substantially increased—although not to the proportion expected—and in that way the Federal Government receives more taxes.

But if it was desired to have this company, if it should be organized, pay a Federal income tax, that could be provided for. I am not sure that under the Tennessee Valley Authority arrangement the company should not pay Federal income taxes. I am rather inclined to believe that it should pay Federal income taxes, under the law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. In view of the inquiry made by the Senator from Alabama about the rates for the power, I wish to ask my colleague whether those rates are fixed by the Federal Power Commission and by the regulatory body of the State of California until they are assumed to be reasonable rates.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The Federal Power Commission has control to a very large extent, but the Railroad Commission of California fixes the rates for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Those two organizations must be satisfied. The Federal Power Commission would not permit too high a rate, and neither would the Railroad Commission of California. So the rates which are charged to consumers in California must be fixed and agreed upon by the State regulatory body, the Railroad Commission of California, and by the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 66, beginning in line 19.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

#### SHIP-REPAIR LABOR ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that it is the desire of the floor leaders to postpone further discussion and a vote on the amendment now pending before the Senate until tomorrow. Therefore, I shall address myself to another subject. Am I to understand, Mr. President, that the floor has been yielded to me in my own right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has been recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a very important issue which is before the country. It deals with the problem of ship-repair labor on the west coast. I assure the Members of the Senate that I regret the lateness of the hour, and I shall take no offense whatever if I address empty seats. The important thing is to get the material and the facts

which I wish to present into the RECORD this afternoon for future reference by Members of the Senate, and by various governmental agencies concerned.

I wish to assure the Senate that I speak from one motive only, namely, that of being helpful to all possible extent in bringing to bear on this problem certain facts within my possession, and of being helpful in seeing to it that those ships which are being damaged in the great heroic battles of the Pacific these days are repaired in the quickest possible time.

I wish to have it distinctly understood that in my judgment there is a responsibility and an obligation of labor to see to it that necessary skilled help is provided for the repair of those vessels within the shortest possible time.

I am convinced that once certain misunderstandings in regard to labor policies are ironed out, labor and the governmental agencies concerned will see to it that those ships to which I have referred are sent back to the battles of the Pacific in record-breaking time.

However, Mr. President, I think it is important that we, and the governmental agencies concerned, keep in mind that there is considerable misunderstanding as of this hour in regard to the causes of the failure on the part of the shipyards of the west coast to have at the present time a sufficient number of men to do the repair work which the Government is calling upon those yards to do.

I wish to assure the Senate, by way of preliminary remarks, that whatever disagreements or misunderstandings may exist between the speaker and any official in the Navy Department, are of no concern to me in relation to the great problem which we must solve. I hope that my remarks will be helpful to the Navy Department, and to certain other governmental agencies as well, in proceeding without further delay to solve the labor problems which I consider to be basic to the crisis now existing in the ship-repair yards on the west coast.

Last week the Navy Department informed the press of a serious shortage of workmen in Pacific coast shipyards. It was pointed out that the lack of sufficient mechanics in the shipyards would prolong the war in the Pacific and cost the lives of additional sailors, soldiers, and marines. It was indicated in the press conference that during the past month the Mare Island Navy Yard had suffered a net loss of 600 workers, so that the yard is now operating 9,000 workers below its ceiling; that the Bremerton, Wash., Navy Yard had lost 600 workers during the past month, and was operating 5,000 workers under its ceiling; and that the Hunters Point naval drydock had lost approximately 700 employees during the past month and needed the services of 6,000 additional workers to complete its operational force.

It was also stated the private ship repair yards in the Puget Sound area needed 8,000 additional workers; that the San Francisco area needed 3,500 additional workers; and that the Los Angeles area needed 5,000.

The inferences flowing from the Navy Department press conference of May 30



were that employees in the navy yards and in the private ship repair yards were more concerned over their personal welfare than in the repairing of our fighting ships in the Pacific fighting zone, and that they were quitting their jobs or refusing to seek employment because they were interested in securing positions which would give them permanent employment when the war ends.

The public's reaction to the Navy Department press statement is that labor in some manner or other is responsible for the shortage of skilled mechanics to do repair work on the Pacific coast.

Undoubtedly the story given to the press by the Navy Department will reach the attention of many of our heroic soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Pacific area. The story as carried in the press cannot help but leave the impression among our fighting forces in the Pacific that labor is letting them down in their most critical hour.

All this is most unfortunate, and the manner of its presentation uncalled for at this time. I do not believe that patriotic support can be secured from workmen by unfair public statements on the part of high naval officials.

I know something relative to the attitude of labor on the Pacific coast. What they have accomplished in the field of shipbuilding is unsurpassed in wartime production in this or any other country.

It was those workmen and their leaders who blazed the way for zone standard agreements to cover the shipbuilding industry during the period of the war. Four zones were established: Great Lakes, Atlantic seaboard, Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific coast. The Pacific coast was the zone selected for the effort to negotiate the first coastwise agreement for the very practical reason that management, and the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry, and labor on the Pacific coast had carried on collective bargaining to a much greater extent than it had been carried on in any other section of the country.

In the early days of our defense program, prior to Pearl Harbor, as a result of a conference held beginning the early part of February 1941, at which management, labor, and the procurement agencies were represented, an agreement was finally reached to which the Government agencies approved establishing a rate of \$1.12 per hour for all competent mechanics employed in the zone between the Mexican border and the Canadian border.

Had it not been for the spirit of helpfulness and cooperation shown by organized labor on the Pacific coast, zone standard agreements would not have been set up in the other three zones.

Labor in the Pacific Northwest made a definite contribution to the policy of stabilizing wages throughout the Pacific zone. They were already receiving \$1.12 and \$1.15 per hour, but in the interest of national welfare they approved of the wage rates set up by the Pacific-coast zone standards, although this meant definitely that they received no increase in wages whatsoever.

I have not been supplied with all of the facts, but I have known workmen long enough to realize that they must be

moved by some urgent motive when large numbers of them indicate this spirit. I am satisfied it was a demonstration of sincere patriotism.

I want to raise the question here whether labor itself is responsible for the present shortage of workmen to do ship repair work on the Pacific coast. Protests which I have received from the west coast allege that the Navy Department, faced with a sudden problem, has looked around for someone on whom the blame and responsibility may be placed.

There has been the over-all policy of the Navy Department for many years to pay approximately the wages paid for workmen in private industry. However, in this instance, seemingly the Navy Department has not been, and is not now, paying the wages to which it gave its approval to private industry on the Pacific coast in 1941.

In private industry the union agreements with employers provide a minimum-wage rate and no maximum. The policy of the Navy Department is to divide all classifications of labor employed in navy yards into first, second, and third class.

With the merits or demerits of the union minimum-wage rate or the Navy Department's policy, I am not concerned at the moment. I am interested in discovering why the present great shortage of labor in the Pacific coast shipyards exists.

In 1941 the rate for mechanics was established at \$1.12. There was a proviso in that agreement that, should the cost of living increase 5 or more percent by April 1, 1942, the increase in the cost of living would be added to the \$1.12.

It happened that the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicated an increase of slightly over 13 percent during the year. The President of the United States, in April 1942, was using his every effort to prevent the inflation which was threatening at that time.

To assist the President in his praiseworthy effort, the shipyard workers on the Pacific coast agreed to accept 8 cents an hour advance instead of the 13-percent increase to which their agreement entitled them. As I commented in connection with another issue a few days ago, the President, in April 1942, wired the Chicago conference and asked the shipbuilding organizations to dispense with the so-called escalator clause of their contract. As I pointed out, that was the clause which provided that as the index of the cost of living went up, wages under the contract would go up at stated intervals in accordance with the index. Labor did dispense with the escalator clause, and the representatives of labor reached this agreement to accept 8 cents an hour advance instead of the 13-cent increase to which their agreement entitled them. The Government was a party to that agreement. This made the rate for journeymen mechanics in the private ship-construction yards of the Pacific coast \$1.20 per hour, and that is the present figure.

I ask my colleagues to keep constantly in mind that we are dealing with two types of yards as we consider this critical problem. We are dealing with the private industry yard, and we are dealing

with the navy yard, or governmental yard. When I use the figure \$1.20 an hour, I am talking about the rate paid in the private yard. That figure was established by the so-called shipbuilding stabilization agreements of April 1942.

Now, how does this \$1.20 operate when the Navy Department endeavors to secure workmen? The navy yards on the Pacific coast pay for most skilled workmen a medium rate, a middle rate, of \$1.20 per hour. Some workmen whom they consider especially skilled—comparatively speaking very few when we look at the total number of employees involved—receive \$1.26 an hour, while the hiring-in rate, the beginning rate, paid as a general practice in the navy yards of the Pacific coast is \$1.14, as compared with \$1.20 in the private yard.

Should the Navy Department be surprised when workmen are unwilling to leave \$1.20 or better to hire out in a Government navy yard at \$1.14 per hour, without any provision, any assurance, any regulations which would indicate to them the steps by which they might eventually be placed in the \$1.20 or \$1.26 class?

But the difficulty now, the shortage of workmen, is not in the field of new ship construction, but in the repair yards. They are needed for the rapid repair of our fighting ships. It is most regrettable that the industrial policy of the Navy Department is producing some serious misunderstandings between the Navy and labor on the west coast.

Since the First World War there has been a special rate for private shipyard workers engaged in repair. It developed independently in the big ship repair ports of the Pacific coast immediately after the First World War. It was known as the "dirty hour," which in practice meant that the men working on ship repair received 9 hours' pay for 8 hours' work because of the skill required and the extremely dirty character and more dangerous nature of ship-repair work. I understand that there are those who question that greater skill is required in the repair yards but by and large, it is generally recognized that greater skill is required on ship-repair work.

I repeat, the rate to which I have referred was known as the "dirty hour" rate, because of the skill required and the extremely dirty character and more dangerous nature of ship-repair work.

Mr. President, I digress from my prepared remarks a moment to point out that we are dealing here with an historical phenomenon. We are dealing here with a wage structure which has great historical precedent behind it. Those who are familiar with the growth of collective bargaining recognize that in the field of labor relations we cannot pass over lightly historical precedents, we cannot, with a wave of the hand, in the light of some emergency which at the moment would seem at first thought to justify it, cast aside long-established precedents and past practices in the field of labor relations. Labor has had to fight too hard historically to get some of these advantages established in their contracts to take silently or without protest, at least without a plea for adjustment, a proposal by some Government official or

agency to wipe away a long-established historical wage pattern.

Please understand—and those familiar with my record I am sure need no persuasion on this point—that no man in the Senate would insist more than the present speaker, whenever it is in the interest of the war effort for labor or any other group in this country to sacrifice some present advantage or past practice in the interest of the war effort. But I do wish to point out that it is very easy, under patriotic sanctions, for officials of the Government to do a great injustice, so far as labor relations are concerned, by using first the argument, this past practice impedes the war effort and should be abolished.

In my experience as a member of the War Labor Board, when I heard that argument, which usually was presented at the beginning of a case, I would press for an analysis of the argument, and I frequently found what I am afraid will be found in the present controversy, that an analysis of the argument will show that the 11.6 percent differential uniformly applied will not impede the war effort but that the war effort will be served by preserving this historical wage rate about which I am speaking.

In fairness, let me point out that there is great dispute, apparently, among the agencies and the companies and the labor organizations concerned as to whether all the companies on the coast were parties to the so-called San Francisco amendments of 1942 or as to whether the procurement agencies were official parties to the amendments.

I am perfectly willing, however, Mr. President, to let the record speak for itself, and I want to say that the issue now is not whether any particular person or agency was or was not a party to the San Francisco amendments of 1942; the issue now is whether or not those amendments of 1942 ought to be applied on a coast-wide basis, not only in the interests of the prosecution of the war but simply in plain fairness and equity to all parties concerned. Unless this problem is solved in the immediate future I predict it is going to be a very hot labor issue in this country, and at a later date I intend to speak at some greater length than I shall this afternoon on this matter. At that time I will present to the Senate data which I think substantiates the thesis that there has been unfair discrimination against some of the ports of the West coast by the Navy, by the ODT, by the Army, by the War Shipping Administration, by these Government agencies that have had charge of the allocation of ships, railroad facilities, and the transportation of cargo to the Pacific war zone.

I digress at this point only long enough to say that for many months the great port of Portland, Oreg., has not been used anywhere near to full capacity. There have been times when 70 percent of the facilities of the port have not been used. My distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and I and other representatives of the West coast have pleaded time and time again with these Government agencies at least to show cause why the facilities

of that port should not be used to a maximum, and each time we were told, "Just wait. Before long you will not be able to take care of the cargo that will go through that port."

The fact remains, Mr. President, that the port was discriminated against so far as the use of its facilities are concerned. Yes, they even went so far as to move longshore gangs from the port of Portland to San Francisco to handle surplus cargo that had reached San Francisco. Yet in the port of Portland railroad facilities were not being used to a maximum, dock facilities were not being used to a maximum. Longshoremen were not provided with full employment and they lost much time and pay waiting for the port to be used. We were continually told by representatives of the Army and the Navy, the War Shipping Administration, and the ODT, "Just wait. Soon you will not be able to take care of the cargo."

Mr. President, I am perfectly aware of the fact that under the exigencies of war clocklike efficiency cannot be expected. I am perfectly willing to be exceedingly charitable, but when months drag on to a 12-month period and the statistics show that after a year that port has not received the use which it should have received, I find it necessary to raise my voice in protest, and I shall speak on the subject, after certain data are supplied me by certain parties and officials in the State of Oregon, at greater length at another hour.

Mr. President, a more polite term for the "dirty hour" was established at the Pacific coast conference in May 1942, at which amendments were made to the existing coastwide ship-repair agreement. To adopt a term more gratifying to those interested in polite English, the "dirty hour" was translated into the 11.6-percent increase which in the pay envelope was identical to receiving the 9 hours' pay for the 8 hours' work on ship repair.

May I say parenthetically that we also need to keep in mind the fact that in peacetime ship-repair work is much more casual than in wartime. It is true that by and large there has been steady employment in the shipyards during the war; in fact, they have been constantly asking for more men. We need to keep in mind, however, the casual nature of the work as a general pattern of work in these yards in order to understand the insistence upon the part of labor that they cling to the historical advantage which they won through collective bargaining when they established the so-called dirty-hour rate of pay.

This pay formula had been in existence for many years, and it was only fair and right that it should be continued. The Government procurement agencies were represented at the April 1942 conference in Chicago, and they called for the amending of these ship-repair agreements on the west coast. They were parties to the San Francisco conference. They were members of the conference subcommittee at San Francisco. And in the end the amendments were officially approved by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, as Senators

will see by certain exhibits which at the close of my remarks I shall ask to have inserted in the Record.

Thus the 11.6 percent became the standard rate for employees in the ship-repair yards on the Pacific coast. What does the 11.6 percent mean to the shipyard workers in private industry? Simply this, that instead of receiving \$1.20 per hour, which is the rate on new ship construction, they receive \$1.34 an hour when employed on ship repair.

I cannot help questioning the practical industrial understanding of some individuals in the Navy Department when they expect highly skilled workmen in the navy yard to work for \$1.26 an hour, when in private industry in the same vicinity the Navy Department is officially party to an agreement which provides the payment of \$1.34 an hour on ship repair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator say that the fact that the workers in the navy yards are not covered by unemployment compensation insurance, whereas they are in the private yards, has a bearing on the possible reluctance of men to leave private yards to go to work in the navy yards, with a possibility of being thrown out of work within a few months without unemployment compensation?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is unquestionably yes, and I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is simply another angle of the whole problem which shows, in my judgment, that the time has come for a reevaluation of the whole labor policy of the Navy in these shipyards, in the interests of a more effective prosecution of the war. Before I get through I intend to discuss at some length the principle which has been applied by the War Labor Board in this case, and I hope to establish to the satisfaction of the Members of the Senate that certainly here is a case where the rare and exceptional case doctrine criterion should be applied by the War Labor Board as it reconsiders this case.

But disparity in labor policies between the Navy and private industry is not the only reason why a problem exists in the repair yards of the Pacific coast. In 1941, when the original ship construction agreement was negotiated by management and labor it covered the entire Pacific coast. There was a question of repair rate, but the Government representatives at that time held that they had not been authorized to negotiate for more than the new construction shipyards. However, they urged management and labor in the ship repair industry to get together and negotiate an agreement covering ship repair. This management and labor on the Pacific coast did within 3 days after the new ship construction agreement had been signed.

That agreement contained variations in the so-called shift premiums. It also continued the practice of many years to pay double time for overtime. I am speaking now of the 1941 agreement.



In 1942 a national shipbuilding conference was held in Chicago, Ill., at which the Government, shipyard management, and shipyard labor throughout the Nation were represented. Among the questions which came up at that conference was the question of the repair agreement on the Pacific coast. It arose because the Navy Department insisted that some of its provisions should be modified.

I emphasized the point, Mr. President, that the record indicates to my satisfaction that in the Chicago conference in 1942 it was the Navy that insisted that the ship-repair agreement on the west coast be modified in some of its particulars.

For this reason the national conference instructed the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee to immediately call a conference of ship-repair management and ship-repair labor on the Pacific coast for the purpose of amending the original coastwide ship-repair agreement of 1941. At this ship-repair conference labor agreed to accept time and a half instead of double time for overtime. It agreed to reduce the amount of shift premiums to the lowest rate then being paid in the Pacific Northwest. That agreement was ratified by a vote of ship-repair yards. It was ratified by a referendum vote of all local unions and all the metal trades councils on the Pacific coast.

In fairness, in behalf of western Senators, I have called upon the procurement agencies to supply us with any information which we do not have. Let me say that if they can supply us with any information not contained in the record which has been placed at our disposal to date, and if that record supports any statement contrary to the statements I am making based upon the record to date, I shall see to it that the correction is made. However, I repeat that to date the procurement agencies have not supplied us with any information at variance with the official records which have been placed at our disposal.

All official records which I have seen to date indicate that the San Francisco ship-repair amendment conference was called as a coast-wide conference, and that it was a Pacific coast ship-repair conference. No question arose, I am told, that it was not a coast-wide ship-repair conference until the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, late in 1943, began to put ship-repair work into what had been new-ship construction yards in southern California.

Let us have an understanding about that change in the direction of ship-repair work on the west coast. Up until the time the procurement agencies started using new-ship construction yards in Los Angeles for repair purposes, ship repair on the west coast was done primarily in the ship-repair yards from San Francisco north. I think we need to bear that material fact in mind when we evaluate at a later time the allegations now made by some parties to this dispute, that the 1942 San Francisco amendments did not cover the southern California yards because some of the principals were not present at that conference.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it has not been the policy—and justifiably so, in many instances—of our war agencies to refuse to apply a general principle to all parties concerned with a problem merely because some of the parties may not have originally been parties to the discussion at the time the principle was agreed upon. It would be very interesting to take some of the decisions of various Government agencies, including the War Labor Board, the Manpower Commission, the WPB, and some others, and try to test their orders and directives on the basis of whether or not all parties to the agreement were present when the agreement or policy was adopted by the Government agency concerned.

Do I need to illustrate the point? If so, I can do it by one very interesting example. Let us take the so-called wartime labor policy resting upon the no-strike, no-lockout agreement. Literally thousands and thousands of American employers and American labor organizations were not present when that agreement was reached with the Government, and yet the Government made it applicable to all, and took the position that it was no defense for employers or labor organizations to come before the War Labor Board and object to jurisdiction on the ground that they were not present when the agreement was reached. In view of the war emergency I defend the policy of the Government in such instances.

Up until 1942 practically all of the repair work being done on the west coast was being done in yards from San Francisco north. The question at this point is whether or not it should be said that the amendments adopted at the 1942 conference, to which the Government was a party, were not applicable to the southern California yards because the managements of the southern California yards were not at the San Francisco Conference. In my judgment we can say in this case, as we have in so many other cases, that we can take judicial notice of the fact that management knew that the parties concerned at the San Francisco Conference were dealing with a ship-repair program, and met to adopt policies which would be applicable on a coast-wide basis.

The Navy Department subsequently held, if I am correctly informed, that the Pacific coast ship repair agreement did not apply to southern California. It took this position in 1943. Some representatives of the Navy Department apparently informed ship-repair yards in the Los Angeles area that if they paid the 11.6 percent, the Government would not reimburse them. I am informed that the Navy Department denies that any such statements were made to ship-repair management by any of its representatives; but I am also informed that in spite of this denial, ship-repair management officials affirm their previous statements.

Be that as it may, it involves a question of fact. It certainly is a question of fact that can be—and I am satisfied will be—brought out when this great case is heard on appeal in the near future by the War Labor Board.

I know from records which I have examined that the managements of ship repair yards of San Francisco and the Pacific Northwest were convinced, when they attended the ship repair conference of 1942, that the amendments were coast wide in nature. Otherwise they would assuredly not have agreed to set up injurious competition by agreeing that southern California ship-repair yards should pay to ship-repair employees a lower rate than was to be paid on the rest of the coast.

Let me say again, by way of digression, that one of the basic problems here is the problem of discrimination in favor of the southern California yards, to the detriment of the northern yards. It seems to me that it stretches our credulity a bit to be asked to assume that labor and the representatives of the procurement agencies, as well as the representatives of management concerned would have entered into the San Francisco amendments of 1942 if they were not to be applied to the southern California area. At that time the southern California area was not doing ship-repair work to any appreciable extent. I do not mean that no ship might not have been repaired in Los Angeles; but I mean that so-called ship-repair work was being sent for the most part into the northern yards. So I say that in my judgment it was a bit late, in 1943, for the Navy Department to say, "The agreements do not apply to the southern California yards."

It is also very significant, Mr. President, to note that the record shows that after it was apparently decided by the procurement agencies that the agreement did not apply to the Los Angeles yards, ship repair work, all out of proportion to its direction to other yards, was directed to the Los Angeles area. I mention that point again to bring attention to bear on the fact that we are dealing here with a problem of discrimination in fact. It seems to me that the intent of those responsible for it is quite immaterial. If, in fact, that has been the result, then it is easy to understand how misunderstandings have developed between the procurement agencies and northern management and the labor organizations concerned.

For 16 months now this question has delayed a final answer. Most of shipyard management on the Pacific coast is agreed. Shipyard labor on the Pacific coast, from Seattle to Los Angeles, are highly indignant; they feel that their own Government has dealt unjustly with them, that in fact it has short-changed them.

For some time there has been a threatened stoppage of work on ship repair in southern California.

Let me say that you will never hear from my lips any defense or any condonation of any stoppage of work in the California area, if it does occur. On the contrary, you will find me saying, as I have said before without exception, that no work stoppage or strike can be justified in time of war. I care not what may be the provocation or what may be the injustice involved; no group of workmen under any circumstances can, in my

judgment, justify a work stoppage in time of war.

However, my protests and yours are not going to change human nature. Under certain circumstances, my protests and yours will not stop men from acting emotionally when they should act on the basis of reason.

Hence I say it is the obligation of the Government to proceed without delay to get to the bottom of this controversy. That should be done, not on the basis of any threat of a strike—I would meet that one head on; I would make very clear that we are not going to tolerate threats—but on the basis of trying to find out what are the causes of the disagreements now existing. I think it is the obligation of the Government to analyze the case in all its details and to end the discrimination which, in my judgment, is the basis of this manpower problem which has arisen.

Mr. President, I repeat that for some time there has been a threatened stoppage of work on ship repair in the southern California yards. It has required most urgent pressure by the metal trades department and the international unions to prevent the taking of a strike vote. However, the situation is as acute as ever. In view of these facts, it is not surprising that labor on the Pacific coast is not flocking into the navy yards or flocking into the private ship-repair yards.

It is my measured opinion that the Navy Department would have been much more practical in its efforts to secure needed labor for ship repair on the Pacific coast if, instead of publicly criticizing labor and indirectly accusing it of a lack of patriotism, it had frankly faced the problem of the payment of the 11.6 percent for repair work done in navy yards on the Pacific coast and in the southern California yards. Personally I think the Navy in all good faith has been misled into believing that the amendments of 1942 did not cover southern California. In my judgment the Navy should publicly recommend to the War Labor Board that the 11.6 percent on ship-repair work be paid throughout the ship-repair yards on the Pacific coast. However, if the Navy is convinced that the 1942 amendments were not intended to cover southern California, then in my judgment the Navy should proceed on the basis that this case involves the rare and exceptional factors which the President had in mind when in all of his wage stabilization Executive orders he reserved the right of the War Labor Board to make exceptions in special or exceptional cases. On the basis of that criterion, I say the Navy should take the position, and should so recommend to the War Labor Board, that this case is one involving matters so vital to the successful prosecution of the war that the 1.6 percent should be a blanket rate paid up and down the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I now request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter published in a San Francisco newspaper—the San Francisco News—by Columnist Arthur Caylor. The letter is entitled "A Letter to the Presi-

dent on 'Battle of San Francisco Bay.'" In the letter the columnist sets out, as I have attempted to point out in some of my remarks, the source of the friction which has arisen between the procurement agencies and labor, and I think it has a very direct bearing upon the points I am making.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT ON "BATTLE OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY"

(By Arthur Caylor)

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: From the cold-chill facts they've just spilled to the public it seems valid to assume Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Horne, and Admiral Nimitz have told you we could lose the war with Japan right here on San Francisco Bay—unless we start getting those fighting ships repaired faster than Jap suicide bombers can rip them apart.

Probably they've told you Mare Island Navy Yard has been given the Nation's No. 1 manpower priority, yet that key repair center is 9,000 men short, and has been losing instead of gaining civilian workers since VE-day—which leaves the Jap one up.

But have they told you a big part of the manpower trouble comes about because, at Mare Island, where the need for men is greatest, the Navy can't pay as much, in many cases, as the Army pays for the same skill at Benicia Arsenal, 5 miles away? Have they told you the Navy can't pay at the same rates men can get at Kaiser's and Moore's and other bay repair yards which actually operate under supervision of Admiral Tisdale, commandant at Mare Island—as agencies of the Navy itself?

The Navy is really appealing to the most highly skilled men in the country—and that's almost the only kind of manpower it can use—to work at Mare Island for sometimes as much as 50 cents an hour less than the Navy will pay them to work just around the corner, where they're not wanted half as much.

This sounds silly, Mr. President. But it's true. And that's the reason I make bold to suggest that, when you're out here a few days hence, you scoot over to Mare Island and fix this thing up. For, while nobody says so, I have a hunch it's one of those interdepartmental matters the President could fix up with a word when the brass hats might spend years getting nowhere. I do know for a fact that Navy higher-ups have been trying for months to bring Mare Island pay to the private-yard level—and they're exactly where they started.

RATIO OF 23 TO 1

You see, all work at the yard is done by civilians. The civilians are under civil service. Civil service sets up the scope of the jobs and the pay therefor. War crisis or no war crisis, that's what the Navy is stuck with. Admiral Tisdale may be the boss, but the only power he can exercise over a civilian worker is to fire him—and he is not likely to fire even the worst goldbricker these days, provided he can get a fraction of a day's work out of him for a day's pay.

The civil-service status of the yard also prevents the unions from moving in. In fact, so long as they could send men elsewhere, the unions naturally chose plants where their members got the union scale and the union had an agreement with the management. They could do that until Mare Island was boosted from No. 3 to No. 1 on the manpower-priority list.

The wonder is that they have anybody left at Mare Island, and the explanation seems to be that thing called patriotism. Thousands stick because they see those stove-in destroyers—because, working in the twisted superstructures where men have died, they realize

what it means when Nimitz says Jap fliers who rode death onto their decks damaged 23 light craft off Okinawa in two successive tries.

Furthermore they realize from Nimitz's statement that only 1 destroyer was sunk while 23 light craft were hit that it is truly a "battle of ship repairs." They know, too, that it's vital to get every fighting ship back into the Pacific as soon as possible so they can inflict new hurt upon Japan before Japan can devise new ways to inflict hurt upon us. They've been told we crushed Germany just in time to escape new devastation by rocket and jet plane—even, the censors have allowed it to be said, by atomic power explosives—which it must be assumed a desperate Japan is trying to bring off.

REPAIRS BIG CHANGE

Skilled workers on the outside, however, don't see any reason they should work for the Navy at Mare Island for less than the Navy will pay them, for instance, at Kaiser's. Perhaps, sir, this has not even been made clear to you.

The reason is that ever since a Commander Farragut took charge in 1858 Mare Island has been primarily a repair yard. To it new construction has always been incidental. Hence it has the repair know-how. Hunters Point is also a specialist on repairs. Bethlehem is one private yard that knows its repair work. Other private yards on the coast are pretty much learning a new business. They just can't hit the Mare Island clip.

Shipbuilding and ship repair are just as different as auto building and auto repair. In the factory a man can spend his life putting fenders on Fords. In the shop he'd better know what makes Lizzy run—even when she's a Cadillac. You ought to see what an electrician is up against when fire-control gets smacked—or what other craftsmen must figure out when they get into a damaged engine room. They just can't be enough supervisors to tell them the answers. The men must know for themselves.

That's why it's so important to get skilled workers to Mare Island in new thousands. That's why draft regulations have been eased. That's why they're muttering again about a labor draft. But while any new legislation might take months, maybe you, Mr. President, could break this pay bottleneck in a minute. It might make all the difference in "the battle of San Francisco Bay."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD only one or two paragraphs from the letter. I shall read only that much of it at this time, in the interest of continuity of my remarks.

Mr. Caylor said:

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: From the cold-chill facts they've just spilled to the public it seems valid to assume Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Horne and Admiral Nimitz have told you we could lose the war with Japan right here on San Francisco Bay—unless we start getting those fighting ships repaired faster than Jap suicide bombers can rip them apart.

Probably they've told you Mare Island Navy Yard has been given the Nation's No. 1 manpower priority, yet that key repair center is 9,000 men short, and has been losing instead of gaining civilian workers since VE-day—which leaves the Jap one up.

But have they told you a big part of the manpower trouble comes about because, at Mare Island, where the need for men is greatest, the Navy can't pay as much, in many cases, as the Army pays for the same skill at Benicia Arsenal, 5 miles away? Have they told you the Navy can't pay at the same rates men can get at Kaiser's and Moore's and other Bay repair yards which actually operate under supervision of Admiral Tisdale, commandant at Mare Island—as agencies of the Navy itself.



Then the author discusses the other disparities and inconsistencies which you will find, if you analyze this problem, existing between and among shipyards on the west coast, including the private yards and the navy yards. Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not read the entire letter; but Senators will be able to read it in the *Record* tomorrow.

Mr. President, a great deal of misunderstanding is being created on the west coast because of unfortunate press statements which have been made by high Navy officials. For example, this morning I received a letter from a citizen of Portland who is very much concerned with this problem. He refers to an admiral, whose name I will not state. He says that an admiral—

and some others are calling the shipyard workers slackers, and I, for one, don't like it. Admiral Land came to the coast some time ago and stated publicly that the shipyards work would soon be cut down.

The yards have been firing workers right and left, sometimes as high as 2,000 a week, and at the same time taking on some new hands. Good men here from the Middle States have been let off, and can you blame any man with a family to look out for seeking to make himself secure when they keep preaching to him of the unemployment ahead?

I wonder if these admirals who cut down the shipbuilding so quickly think the Japs are a pushover, as we say.

The workers who have had some part in the program of shipbuilding which supplies the world and helps win the war should certainly not be called slackers by the men who are now complaining.

I imagine skilled mechanics are now needed to repair these broken ships that are coming in. A raise in their wage scale with a bonus on staying to the finish would probably get all the help needed. I only wish we could encourage the worker to do a good job, instead of calling him "slacker."

I wish to say that I think it is most regrettable that these name-calling tactics are being followed. Such a course creates misunderstandings. It is not helpful to the problem, and in my judgment it is entirely and totally uncalled for.

Mr. President, on May 21 I addressed a letter to George W. Taylor, Chairman of the National War Labor Board, in behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. MITCHELL], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I shall now read it.

MAY 21, 1945.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,  
Washington, D. C.  
Attention: Dr. George W. Taylor,  
Chairman.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing this letter in behalf of Senators MITCHELL and MAGNUSON, of Washington, Senator CORDON, of Oregon, Senator DOWNEY, of California, and myself.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the only reason why the name of the very distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was not included in this letter is because of the fact that I was unable to reach him on that day. I have, however, discussed the matter with him since, and he has expressed to me his agreement that we should seek from the agencies concerned the information which I have asked for in this letter.

Continuing with the reading of my letter to Dr. Taylor, the letter states:

As Senators from the West, we are very much concerned over representations which have been made to us relative to the application of a wage differential in ship repair yards on the west coast whereby southern California ship repair yards are placed in a more favorable position than the ship repair yards from San Francisco north. It is our understanding that a recent decision of the Shipbuilding Commission of the War Labor Board holds to the effect that the 11.6-cent wage differential for ship repair work does not apply to the southern California yards. The implications of such a decision, if it becomes final, would have tremendous economic repercussions in every one of the west coast States.

As Senators from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, we are very much concerned about the matter, and consider it our duty to call upon the National War Labor Board for a full report of the history of this case and of its present status.

At the present time we are seeking information as to the background of the matter and as to what is shown in the records of the case to date. It would be very helpful to us if the National War Labor Board would have prepared and submitted to us at an early date a report setting out in chronological outline the history, facts, and rulings to date pertaining to this case. In submitting a report to us, we would particularly like to be informed as to what your records show has been the position taken by the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission throughout the history of this case. Some of the protests we have received allege that the procurement agencies were parties to the so-called San Francisco amendments but have, nevertheless, been instrumental in making representations to the fact that the 11.6 differential should not apply to the southern California yards.

Further, we would like to be informed as to whether or not the National War Labor Board has scheduled or contemplates scheduling a public hearing on the case when the appeal from the Shipbuilding Commission's ruling is heard.

If, in the opinion of the National War Labor Board, we would be given a better understanding of the case by attending a special session of the Board, at which session the case could be explained to us, we would try to meet with the Board because we are very anxious to make certain that we fully understand all the facts of the case before we take any further steps in regard to this very vital west-coast problem, and we would be glad to abide by your pleasure in regard to such a discussion meeting.

I am sure that the members of the Board will appreciate fully the sincerity of our interests in this matter because obviously, if the Ship Building Commission's decision has the effect of discriminating against ship-repair yards from San Francisco north, we shall wish to take such steps as may be necessary on a congressional level to remedy the situation.

Your immediate attention to our request would be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

As of the same date, in behalf of the Senators, whom I have previously mentioned, I sent a letter to the Secretary of the Navy which stated:

MAY 26, 1945.

HON. JAMES FORRESTAL,  
Secretary of the Navy,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which has been sent to the National War Labor Board on behalf of Senators MITCHELL and MAGNUSON, of Washing-

ton; Senator CORDON, of Oregon; Senator DOWNEY, of California; and myself. It pertains to the west coast ship-repair wage-differential issue, which has become a matter of great concern to us.

After we receive the report from the National War Labor Board which we have requested, we shall ask for the privilege of discussing the matter with you so that we may obtain an official statement of the Navy's position on this issue. If, in the meantime, there is any material which you would like to have us consider along with the NWLB report of the case, we will be very pleased to receive it.

Very sincerely yours.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at this point as a part of my remarks similar letters which were written to Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and to Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,

Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which has been sent to the National War Labor Board on behalf of Senators MITCHELL and MAGNUSON, of Washington; Senator CORDON, of Oregon; Senator DOWNEY, of California, and myself. It pertains to the west coast ship repair wage differential issue which has become a matter of great concern to us.

After we receive the report from the National War Labor Board which we have requested, we shall ask for the privilege of discussing the matter with you so that we may obtain an official statement of the Army's position on this issue. If, in the meantime, there is any material which you would like to have us consider along with the NWLB report of the case, we will be very pleased to receive it.

Very sincerely yours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 1, 1945, I received the following letter from Dr. Taylor, Chairman of the National War Labor Board:

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your letter written on behalf of Senators MITCHELL and MAGNUSON, of Washington; Senator CORDON, of Oregon; Senator DOWNEY, of California, and yourself, in which concern is expressed about the action of the National War Labor Board in denying payment of the 11.6 percent wage differential on repair and conversion work in the shipyards of southern California on the same basis upon which it is paid in the shipyards of San Francisco and the west coast north of San Francisco.

In response to the request made in your letter, we shall submit a report setting out the history, facts, and rulings of the Board pertaining to the ship-repair differential on the west coast. Such a report would have reached you before this date but for the fact that Mr. Keezer has been away from Washington. He is the public member of the Board who has been most consistently in touch with the recent developments of the ship repair differential issue and I therefore want to have him check our report to you. Mr. Keezer has now returned and will work with me in getting the detailed report to you promptly.

In the meantime, I am sending you with this letter a copy of an opinion explaining why the Board, on July 13, 1944, refused to order an extension of the ship-repair differential to the shipyards of southern California. This was when the issue was most recently before the Board.

That was July 13, 1944. Incidentally, the issue had been before a special commission of the board since then, but not before the Board itself. The Board has not had an opportunity to correct what in my judgment is a great wrong. I am trusting that upon appeal, when the matter is viewed from the angles of the exigencies of the present moment, and the case is viewed from the standpoint of the successful prosecution of the war, the Board will see fit to apply the rare and exceptional case doctrine to it.

I read further from Dr. Taylor's letter.

In reading this opinion—

That is, the opinion of the Board of July 13, 1944—

you will note that representatives of the United States Navy, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration urged the Board to deny extension of the ship-repair differential to the southern California yards and that in so doing said that such an extension would hamper them in getting ahead with winning the war.

I think that statement calls for a squaring of the position taken by representatives of the procurement agencies at the San Francisco Conference of 1942 with their subsequent representations before the National War Labor Board.

I return to the letter.

In this connection it was noted that the administration of the ship-repair differential in some of the northern yards had so far divorced it from compensation for the special requirements of ship-repair work that escort girls were paid a differential of 11.6 percent for escorting visitors through repair yards.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to say that if abuses had developed under the ship-repair agreement I would be the first to insist that those abuses be eliminated. The existence of abuses did not, in my judgment, justify a discrimination in favor of the southern California yards as against the northern California yards. In my humble opinion, power existed to eliminate the abuses. But, as I see the facts of the case, there was no justification for setting out the southern California yards in a preferred position. However, I do not pass judgment at this time upon any alleged abuses or for that matter upon the merits of the Board's decision except to say that the decision has not solved the problem.

I return to Dr. Taylor's letter.

As is indicated by the opinion, the unions argued their case upon a construction placed by them upon an agreement made with the Government procurement agencies. This agreement, they claimed, required that the ship-repair differential should be made uniformly effective in all yards on the Pacific coast. It was our conclusion, however, that the procurement agencies were correct in their contention that there had in fact been no such agreement.

Also we were of the opinion that our shipbuilding commission had been correct in its conclusion that the extension of the differential to the southern California yards could not be justified by reference to the prevailing policies of wage stabilization.

While refusing to extend the ship-repair differential to southern California yards on the same basis it is paid in the north, the Board specifically recognized the propriety

of special compensation for the special requirements of actual repair work. Such compensation is at present provided in a variety of forms and amounts by most of southern California yards. The Board, in effect, invited those engaged in ship-repair work in southern California to work out and submit plans adequately to provide such compensation but eliminating the abuses which had been demonstrated to characterize the application of the 11.6 percent differential in the northern yards. This attitude was not only expressed in the opinion I am enclosing but also in conferences with representatives of the workers in the southern California shipyards in which I participated along with Mr. Davis, while he was Chairman of the Board, and with representatives of the procurement agencies.

As you know, cases involving compensation for ship repair work for southern California shipyards will again be before the Board shortly. I shall gladly communicate to the Board your excellent suggestion that the Senators for whom you write meet with the Board in order to provide assurance that all aspects of the problem involved are fully understood. You may be assured of my personal desire, which I know is shared by the Board, to have you and your senatorial colleagues secure the data necessary for a complete understanding of what the Board has done in dealing with the issue in extending the ship-repair differential to southern California shipyards, and why.

If the detailed report which we shall send you shortly, leaves any questions unanswered, we should be eager to have the opportunity to answer them.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE W. TAYLOR,  
Chairman.

N. B.—I am enclosing enough copies of this letter and the opinion to enable you to furnish them to your colleagues if you so desire.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the War Labor Board's directive order of June 22, 1944, and its opinion of July 13, 1944, in this case, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the order and opinion were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,  
June 22, 1944.

IN THE MATTER OF BETHLEHEM STEEL CO. (SHIPBUILDING DIVISION), TERMINAL ISLAND, CALIF., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL NO. 9

(Case No. 2245-CS-D)

#### DIRECTIVE ORDER

By virtue of and pursuant to the powers vested in it by Executive Order 9017 of January 12, 1942, the Executive orders and regulations issued under the Act of Congress of October 2, 1942, and the War Labor Disputes Act of June 25, 1943, the National War Labor Board having accepted the petition for review filed in the above-entitled case and having reviewed the merits of the case, hereby decides the dispute between the parties and orders:

I. The directive order of the Shipbuilding Commission, dated December 1, 1943, in the above-entitled case is hereby affirmed and adopted as the order of the National War Labor Board.

II. Any clauses in the agreement regarding payment for work on ship repair which were made contingent on the ultimate disposition of the dispute regarding the 11.6 percent repair differential shall be renegotiated by the parties and, if necessary, resubmitted to the Shipbuilding Commission for approval

or for determination by supplemental directive order.

Representing the public: Lloyd K. Garrison, Dexter M. Keezer, Edwin E. Witte.

Representing industry: Walter T. Margetts, Earl F. Blank, S. Bayard Colgate.

Representing labor: Dissenting: R. J. Thomas, John Brophy, Robert J. Watt.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,  
June 22, 1944.

IN THE MATTER OF LOS ANGELES SHIPBUILDING & DRY DOCK CORP., SAN PEDRO, CALIF., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 9, CIO

(Case No. 25-648-A)

#### DIRECTIVE ORDER

By virtue of and pursuant to the powers vested in it by Executive Order 9017 of January 12, 1942, the Executive orders and regulations issued under the act of Congress of October 2, 1942, and the War Labor Disputes Act of June 25, 1943, the National War Labor Board having accepted the petition for review filed in the above-entitled case, and having reviewed the merits of the case, hereby decides the dispute between the parties and orders:

I. The ruling of the Shipbuilding Commission dated December 1, 1943, in the above-entitled case is hereby affirmed and adopted as the order of the National War Labor Board.

II. Any clauses in the agreement submitted to the National War Labor Board which deal with the payment for work on ship repair and to which the union agreed on the assumption that either the dirty hour or the 11.6-percent ship-repair differential would be approved by this Board shall be renegotiated by the parties and, if necessary, resubmitted to the Shipbuilding Commission for approval or for determination by supplemental directive order.

Representing the public: Lloyd K. Garrison, Dexter M. Keezer, Edwin E. Witte.

Representing industry: Walter T. Margetts, Earl F. Blank, S. Bayard Colgate.

Representing labor (dissenting): R. J. Thomas, John Brophy, Robert J. Watt.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,  
July 13, 1944.

IN THE MATTER OF BETHLEHEM STEEL CO. (SHIPBUILDING DIVISION) TERMINAL ISLAND, CALIF., AND INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, LOCAL NO. 9

(Case No. 2245-CS-D (25-373-4))

#### OPINION

The sole issue in this case is whether the decision of the Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board dated December 1, 1943, denying the union's request for the establishment of a wage differential of 11.6 percent to be applied to repair work should be affirmed or whether the Commission's decision should be reversed and the Bethlehem Steel Co., shipping division, at Terminal Island, Calif., be required to pay that differential for repair work.

This issue, now before the Board on appeal, has been fully discussed before the Board at two hearings the first on March 27, 1944, and the second on June 8, 1944. At the first hearing permission was granted to the Metal Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, to intervene. Parties having a major interest in the outcome of the case who were not present at the first hearing were invited to attend the hearing held on June 8, 1944. The Board has also had the benefit of numerous briefs, comments, and suggestions submitted by interested parties.

The background of the dispute, the history of the development on the west coast of a differential in pay for repair work and the reasons underlying the Commission's determination of the case are fully set forth in



the opinions of Cochairmen Paul A. Dodd and William E. Simkin, of the Shipbuilding Commission. They need not be repeated.

Representatives of Government procurement agencies, namely, the United States Navy, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration participated at the hearing conducted by the Board on June 8, 1944, and urged the Board to affirm the Shipbuilding Commission's decision and deny the application of the union to establish the repair differential in the southern California area. The procurement agencies concurred fully in the findings of the Commission that (a) the existence of the repair differential in the shipyards located in the San Francisco area and the areas to the north is not in itself sufficient to justify its extension under national wage stabilization policies to all areas in the Pacific coast, and (b) the need for the repair differential in southern California was not sustained on its own merits nor is the differential necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

The procurement agencies opposed the introduction of the repair differential into the Los Angeles-San Diego area and stated: (a) that the differential would increase the cost of production since there was no showing that there would be an increase in production or efficiency; (b) that as a matter of equity there is no basis for a differential between repair and new construction work; (c) that the differential cannot be justified as a premium for special skill; (d) that to introduce the differential into the Los Angeles area will create unstabilizing conditions and result in future pressure for equalization of rates on higher levels not only for new construction work in the shipbuilding industry but for other industries; (e) that there is no traditional background in the Los Angeles area for a repair differential; (f) that the entire Pacific coast is not a single labor market and that there have traditionally been differentials between regions on the Pacific coast and that, therefore, the payment of the differential in northern California, Oregon, and Washington, does not create an inequity in southern California; (g) that the operation of the repair differential in northern California has created conditions that interfere with the fully effective prosecution of the war program as demonstrated by recent difficulties in the San Francisco area.

In a letter addressed to the Shipbuilding Commission, dated October 15, 1943, interested Government agencies stated in part:

"The experience in the areas where the repair differential now exists has demonstrated that continual migration occurs through the effort of workers to transfer to shipyards where repair work is prevalent; that production is adversely affected through unrest caused by the desire of workers to increase their 'take-home'; that workers once assigned to repair work are reluctant to accept any employment under other conditions; that workers customarily employed on repair work frequently refuse to accept work on new construction and commonly will lay off whenever repair work runs short, rather than to remain continuously employed if they must accept new construction rates; that whenever both repair and new construction work must be assigned to the same yard, immediate unrest occurs, resulting in work stoppages or slow-downs because of the differing conditions."

In that part of its opinion dealing with some of the practical difficulties in administering the 11.6-percent repair differential, the majority of the Shipbuilding Commission remarked:

"An employee in the machine shop may work first on a piece of metal being toolled for a repair job, then on one for use on a new construction job, all during the course of a single shift's operation. Would he, were the repair differential in force in the yard, re-

ceive two different rates of pay for performing what in reality is identically the same work? Or, if this man worked on repair work only, say for a week, would he, upon completion of the repair job welcome returning to the new construction work at some 11 percent below his old rate? What would his work mate across the aisle say if he gets all—or even more than what is thought to be a proper share—of the repair work, while for the same type of work this man gets only the base pay without the differential?"

"It is not hard in the face of these realities," the Commission concluded, "to understand some of the difficulties and abuses which, according to the record in these cases, have developed along with the application of the differential in the yards along the west coast north of southern California."

It is the considered judgment of the National Board, that in the light of the statements by representatives of Government agencies and the findings of the Shipbuilding Commission the Board cannot in the absence of clear and convincing reasons to the contrary reverse the Shipbuilding Commission's determination.

We do not find justification for reversing the Commission's decision. The argument relied on in the main by the union at the recent hearings before the Board was that there exists an all-inclusive coastwise repair agreement on the west coast obligating all shipbuilding companies on the west coast engaged in ship-repair work to pay the 11.6 percent repair differential.

The 11.6-percent repair differential was first incorporated into a written agreement at Seattle, Wash., on April 1, 1941. Bethlehem Steel Co. was not represented at the Seattle conference nor did the company agree to be bound by the 11.6-percent repair differential which was negotiated at the conference by representatives of various shipbuilding companies and the American Federation of Labor. Representatives of the Government agencies were not present at the Seattle conference.

In May 1942 a ship-repair conference was held in San Francisco at which representatives of the Government were present. The agreement negotiated at the San Francisco conference included, among other provisions, a provision for the payment of the repair differential which had originally been agreed upon at Seattle. The agreement specifically provided that it was "subject to the final ratification or approval by the principals of the representatives attending the Pacific coast ship-repair conference in San Francisco, which convened May 29, 1942." No evidence was produced that Bethlehem Steel Co., Terminal Island, ever ratified or approved the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement.

Arguments have been made that nothing took place at the San Francisco repair conference which would have led the labor groups to believe that the repair agreement was not intended to be coastwise in the same manner as the master agreement covering new construction had been; that the procurement agencies did not indicate directly or indirectly that the repair agreement would not be coastwise; that the companies in southern California were bound as a matter of good faith to abide by the terms of the agreement which had been approved by the majority of the west-coast shipbuilding companies, and that the procurement agencies well know that the purpose of the ship-repair conference was to establish uniform conditions throughout the Pacific coast.

The testimony as to just what had been the intentions of the Government representatives and the participants at the San Francisco repair conference is conflicting. This is quite understandable. The Government representatives testified that at the San Francisco conference they sought to have the repair agreement, embodying the 11.6-percent differential made coastwise, but were turned

down both by management and labor. Later when the leaders of the labor organizations engaged in shipbuilding on the west coast united in an effort to have the 11.6-percent differential extended to southern California, the representatives of the Government agencies had changed their minds on the desirability of having the differential made applicable up and down the Pacific coast because, in the words used by one of them at the hearing on June 8, "between 1942 and today we have seen how that 'darned' differential operates."

Nonetheless, it is quite clear that the agreement reached at San Francisco in 1942 specifically provided that it was subject to approval or ratification by the principals. It is equally clear that Bethlehem has never approved or ratified that agreement. Whatever may have been the intentions of the participants at the conference, we cannot hold that the company was bound by an agreement to which it was not a party. We cannot subscribe to the position of the union that there exists on the west coast a coastwise ship repair agreement binding not only the signatories to that agreement but all companies on the west coast engaged in ship repair.

Also we find no evidence that would justify us in upsetting the finding of the shipbuilding commission that the payment of the repair differential is not justified under wage stabilization policies. The Commission found that approval of the differential could not be made on the basis of correcting substandards of living; that no claim was made that further adjustments were due under the 15 percent Little Steel formula; that no justification for the differential exists under any reasonable interpretation of the principle of permitting adjustments up to the minimum of the brackets of the sound, the tested, going rates for the same or similar types of work within the area; that the differential cannot be justified on the ground that repair work as a whole is so much difficult than the new construction work that an inequity exists between the two that justifies the payment of the differential.

While on the basis of evidence presented, the Board must reject the union's contention that the 11.6 percent differential should be paid to all employees engaged in repair work on the Pacific coast, it does not follow that a perfect solution of the general problem presented in this case is thus attained. On the contrary much remains to be done before such a solution can be plausibly claimed.

The record in these cases makes it clear that in the Pacific coast shipbuilding areas now under consideration there is frequently substantial economic justification for special wage allowance for work on ship repair as opposed to new construction. The historical justification for such an allowance is that ship repair work is occasionally dirtier, frequently requires special skill, and affords less regular employment than work on new construction. During wartime the latter justification has largely disappeared, but the other two justifications may remain and apply in varying degrees to varying situations.

In San Francisco and the Pacific shipbuilding centers to the north, however, special compensation for ship repair work which was originally based upon special requirements of such work has been so standardized and generalized that it has in some instances lost all relation to its original economic justification. How far this process has gone in some cases can be illustrated by the fact that in one of the northern yards escort girls have been paid the repair differential of 11.6 percent for that part of their labors devoted to escorting visitors through the part of the yard devoted to repair work. Such an arrangement makes more understandable the opposition of the Government agencies to any extension of the differential south of San Francisco.

At the same time it appears that some of the small yards in southern California make no provisions for special compensation for repair work, while the adequacy of the provision made by other yards has not been tested by detailed inquiry. Representatives of the Bethlehem Co. testified that it makes a variety of provisions for special pay for repair work which are not made by the shipbuilding companies in the north, such as double pay for all Sunday repair work and double time for Saturday and holiday work on commercial repairs. Also the company's contract with the union provides for special compensation at one-half the regular hourly pay for unusually dirty work. It is the opinion of the majority of the Shipbuilding Commission, which is underlined in the concurring opinion of the Chairman of the Commission, that "the present program of the Government procurement agencies which permits the contractor to pay premium rates to workers based upon exceptional skill and special qualifications, together with the contract provisions for 'unusually dirty work' \* \* \* afford adequate and fair allowances for any real and permanent differences in work requirements or qualifications which the performance of one type of work may exact over the other type."

On this point the Board accepts the conclusion of its Shipbuilding Commission which is applicable to other companies having similar contract provisions. However, as the Commission recognizes, the conclusion does not necessarily apply in the case of some companies which have no such contract provisions. Also there has been no detailed inquiry into the actual practice of companies having such contract provisions in utilizing them together with the payment of premium rates to provide appropriate compensation for repair work. Thus work remains to be done to provide complete assurance that adequate compensation is consistently provided for repair work in the southern California shipyards, where in fact in any given instance the individual worker employs greater skill or the particular work is excessively dirty. It is work in which the Shipbuilding Commission, the procurement agencies, and the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee can be expected to be actively and continuously interested.

However, the problem specifically before this Board is in this case not that of providing what seem to be some needed reforms in the administration of the 11.6 percent ship-repair differential in the north. Neither is it that of devising and prescribing an appropriate scheme of compensation for ship-repair work in the south—a task which is complicated by the fact that some contracts of the shipbuilding companies in southern California which make no provision for special payment for repair work run for the duration of the war. As stated at the outset, the sole issue before the Board is whether or not the Shipbuilding Commission should be affirmed in its decision denying the union's request that the Bethlehem Co. be required to pay a differential of 11.6 percent on repair work. On this issue a majority of the Board, with its labor members dissenting, sustains the decision of the Commission. To do otherwise would require the Board to disregard the assertion of representatives of our fighting forces that extension of the 11.6 percent differential would hamper them in getting ahead with winning the war, and the finding of our own Shipbuilding Commission after extensive study of the problem and hearings on the west coast that there is foundation for such an assertion. It would require the Board to do this in spite of the fact that neither contractual obligations nor principles of wage stabilization place any compulsion upon it to extend the differential southward to the Bethlehem Co. at Terminal Island. Under such circumstances the Board would be neglectful of its duties as a National

War Labor Board if it were to order such an extension of the differential.

DEXTER M. KEEZER,  
Public Member.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on page 2 of the opinion we find this language:

The procurement agencies opposed the introduction of the repair differential into the Los Angeles-San Diego area and stated: (a) that the differential would increase the cost of production since there was no showing that there would be an increase in production or efficiency.

That is obviously true; if they paid 11.6 percent more, there would be an increase in cost.

(b) That as a matter of equity there is no basis for a differential between repair and new construction work.

That is a very disputed point, Mr. President, and of course it goes to the very issue as to whether or not this differential should have existed historically. But why should the procurement agencies take it upon themselves to make representations to the War Labor Board that this differential should not be continued?

In my judgment, the position they took when the case was before the Board is partly responsible for the bad feeling and the misunderstanding which has developed between the procurement agencies and the parties concerned.

(c) That the differential cannot be justified as a premium for special skill; (d) that to introduce the differential into the Los Angeles area will create unstabilizing conditions and result in future pressure for equalization of rates on higher levels not only for new construction work in the shipbuilding industry but for other industries; (e) that there is no traditional background in the Los Angeles area for a repair differential.

As to the last point, Mr. President, I repeat that the Los Angeles yards have been used as new-construction yards and not repair yards prior to the war and the repair work was initiated with this war. Does that justify the procurement agencies making the argument that because the southern California yards have not done the repair work before this war they should come in, upset a differential which has existed and been paid on the west coast since before the First World War in those yards which have done most of the repair work?

(f) That the entire Pacific coast is not a single labor market and that there have traditionally been differentials between regions on the Pacific coast, and that therefore the payment of the differential in northern California, Oregon, and Washington does not create an inequity in southern California.

They overlooked the point that we are dealing, in the shipping industry, with zone agreements. Of course, there are in other industries differentials on the west coast, but we are dealing here with an agreement which seeks to provide a uniform policy for the west coast in ship-repair work.

(g) That the operation of the repair differential in northern California has created conditions that interfere with the fully effective prosecution of the war program as demonstrated by recent difficulties in the San Francisco area.

I assume that the procurement agencies refer there to alleged abuses which

have crept into various ship-repair and new-construction agreements on the west coast, but I do not think they are germane to the real issue before us, as to whether or not a discriminatory policy should have been set up on the west coast, aided and abetted by the procurement agencies.

It is an excellent opinion, Mr. President, in setting forth the War Labor Board's point of view. I do not agree with the findings, nevertheless, I respect the Board's judgment in the premises. I am convinced that present emergencies make the decision undesirable as a fixed policy.

It is interesting to note that the labor members of the Board dissented, and it is also interesting to note that this differential issue has continued over the months because of the great unrest in the shipyards on the west coast.

Mr. President, on May 28 I received a telegram from the Metal Trades Conference, meeting in convention in San Francisco, in regard to this problem, and I replied to it on May 29. In order to keep the record straight I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram and my answer to it inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 29, 1945.

E. M. WESTON,

President, Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, Eureka Calif.

Wire signed by you and many other Metal Trades Council representatives received. Recently sent following letter to Secretary of Navy Forrestal, Secretary of War Stimson, and Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission:

"I am enclosing a copy of a letter which has been sent to the National War Labor Board on behalf of Senators MITCHELL and MAGNUSON, of Washington, Senator CORDON, of Oregon, Senator DOWNEY, of California and myself. It pertains to west coast ship-repair wage differential issue which has become a matter of great concern to us.

"After we receive the report from the National War Labor Board which we have requested, we shall ask for the privilege of discussing the matter with you so that we may obtain an official statement of your department's position on this issue. If in the meantime there is any material which you would like to have us consider along with the NWLB report of the case, we will be very pleased to receive it."

Have also requested detailed report from National War Labor Board. In that request I stated, "As Senators from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California we are very much concerned about the matter and consider it our duty to call upon the National War Labor Board for a full report of the history of this case and of its present status. In submitting a report to us, we would particularly like to be informed as to what your records show has been the position taken by the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission throughout the history of this case."

I wish to assure you that Senators from Washington, Oregon, and California will continue to seek clarification of this case. If present ruling favorable to southern California repair yards can be justified we shall insist that officials concerned demonstrate beyond question that it can be justified.

WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senator.



EUREKA, CALIF., May 28, 1945.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Gathered now in Eureka, Calif., are the representatives of the local metal trades councils of the Pacific coast and also officers of the international unions comprising the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, whose members locally form the local metal trades councils, all of whom are parties to the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement as negotiated in 1941 by the repair shipyard agreement and the members of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor. Present at our conference in Eureka are the representatives of labor who took part in negotiating the repair agreement of 1941 and the amendments to that agreement negotiated May 1942 by labor, shipyard management, and the official representatives of the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board. These amendments were officially approved by the Assistant, and now Under Secretary of the Navy and by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. One of the amendments provided for the payment of the 11.6 percent for ship-repair work above the wage rate for new-ship construction work throughout the Pacific coast. The Navy Department and the Maritime Commission has consistently refused to pay this repair rate or permit employers to pay it in southern California. This act of bad faith has now existed for 16 months, despite our continued efforts to have the appropriate Federal agencies correct this great injustice to ship-repair workmen in southern California. Because of the patriotic determination of the workers on the Pacific coast to keep our fighting ships in the Pacific repaired without delay, they have refrained from resorting to the use of their economic power to enforce the terms of the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement. This action of the Navy Department and Maritime Commission in repudiating the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement has so affected the morale of the members of the metal trades unions that they have completely lost faith in agencies of government to discharge their share of the responsibility of enforcing the provisions of a tripartite agreement. We have been informed of the sincere interest which the United States Senators and Congressmen from the Pacific coast are taking in this problem, which justifies our again appealing to you. We heartily appreciate your friendly assistance in a situation which we now believe can only be adjusted through your continued interest in our rights under the ship-repair amendments of 1942. We now earnestly request that should your present efforts in our behalf fail of success that you use your influence to institute a congressional investigation of this intolerable situation.

E. M. Weston, President, Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council; M. H. Stafford, Executive Secretary, Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council; Orrin Burrows, Bremerton (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; W. L. Rotermund, Eureka (Calif.) Metal Trades Council; Walter Gallant, Everett (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; Emil Schlecht, Kelso-Longview (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; A. L. Laster, Los Angeles (Calif.) Metal Trades Council; Roy C. Hill, Portland (Oreg.) Metal Trades Council; Cecil Seaman, Pasco (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; M. L. Ratcliff, San Diego (Calif.) Metal Trades Council; A. F. O'Neill, Seattle (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; Don Ahrens, Tacoma (Wash.) Metal Trades Council; A. T. Wynn, Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif.; William Lazarini, International Molders Union of North America; Clayton Bilderback, United Asso-

ciation of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters; J. Earl Cook, Sheet Metal Workers International Association; Joseph Clark, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America; Don Cameron, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Tom Crowe, International America; Frank Weibel, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers of America; J. A. Johnson, International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen of America; Otto Reiman, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; R. Corey, International Union of Operating Engineers; George Castleman, International Association of Machinists.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to point out that for the past several months not only have many thousands of workers been let out of west coast shipyards, but the workers have had made available to them official reports of the Government showing that in the months to come shipyard employment is to be cut back drastically.

I understand that shipyard work is to be cut back; yet it seems to me, Mr. President, that until the war in the Pacific is won we can justify and we must accept, perhaps as one of the costly wastes of war—because war itself is wasteful—the maintaining in our shipyards of the manpower necessary to meet the emergencies of the war. I know it can be said, and I want to be fair, that when the agencies issued some of their public announcements, notifying labor there were to be these sharp cut-backs in shipyard employment, they did not anticipate the emergency in which we now find ourselves. I am not a military expert, and I am not prepared to say whether or not these agencies should have anticipated this emergency. Nevertheless I take it for granted that they did not anticipate that we were going to have this very heavy ship-repair job to do as the result of Japanese suicide attacks on our Pacific Fleet.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, the fact is that the shipyard workers have been told that thousands of them are going to be let out of employment. I have before me a report of the War Manpower Commission entitled "War Manpower Commission Estimate of Month-End Manpower Requirements in Six Major Shipbuilding Establishments—Ship Construction Only, Based on Present Contracts June 1, 1945." The report supports the statements which have been made by Government officials in recent weeks. The report shows the difficulty that confronts the War Manpower Commission in stemming the tide of manpower movements away from the shipyards.

The total figures found in the report, Mr. President, as of April 1, 1945, are not the figures of total shipyard employment during this war. The total shipyard employment was much higher than the figures as of April 15, 1945. But covering the yards concerned, the Oregon Shipbuilding, Kaiser Co., Inc., Vancouver, Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Willamette Iron and Steel, Commercial

Iron Works, Albina Iron and Machine, all located in my own State of Oregon, the figure as of April 1, 1945, was 92,887. The estimated figure for December 1, 1945, is 41,000. In other words, the Government has pointed out to these shipyard workers that their number is going to be reduced in just these yards in my State from 92,887 to 41,000.

The same type of report has been issued in regard to other shipyards on the west coast—with what result? Well, Senators you know how the grapevine travels, as we say in labor circles. It just went down through those yards, "Boys, it is almost over. We are going to be let out in great numbers. We had better look for other jobs." And many of them have left the yards.

Let me point out, so I will not be misunderstood, that many of them were let out of the yards, too. There have been great numbers of dismissals in these yards in recent months.

Now, Mr. President, we come into an emergency situation. Officials of the Navy call men slackers because they have acted—and I think it is understandable why they have done so—on the basis of statements from this Government itself that there going to be these heavy cut-backs. So many of those who have jobs in the Middle West have gone back to them, and many of those who have farms in the Middle West have gone back to them.

What are we going to do about it? I can assure you, Mr. President, that according to my sights the answer is not "Give to the procurement agencies compulsory manpower control." They just make too many mistakes to have any such great power placed at their disposal. The answer is, in my judgment, that we have to be perfectly realistic about this problem, and recognize that if we are to get the men back there that are needed we must give them assurance that discriminatory policies will not be practiced. We must give them assurance that the Army and the Navy, as well as private concerns that are not paying the differential, will pay the differential as the first step in the ironing out of this problem.

Then, I think, Mr. President, we ought to be much, much more intellectually honest about this manpower problem in the shipyards. We have got to recognize that sometimes emergencies develop which require a greater use of manpower than we are able to use always day by day. I for one make no apologies, Mr. President, for the suggestion that we will back up our boys in the Pacific much better if we spend the millions of dollars that may be necessary to keep those men in the yards on the job available for work, than to encourage them, as we have in recent months, to go back to the Middle West, to leave the shipyards, and then find ourselves stranded when an emergency such as the present one develops.

Mr. President, I do not believe in unnecessary waste, but I say that we can ill afford to save dollars when it comes to protecting and saving lives in the Pacific.

I do not suggest that we pay men to loaf until their services are needed. But

I do say that it would be very sensible to place contracts in the shipyards on the west coast for peacetime construction which would keep the men working in that area so that when such an emergency as the present one arises they could be transferred quickly to the repair yards for work. The safety of our men in the Pacific demands such foresightedness. We must keep those workers available until this war is won no matter what the cost.

I also wish to introduce in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, a series of telegrams which the west coast regional office of the War Manpower Commission has sent to the Portland office of the Manpower Commission, which show that the Manpower Commission has been doing its level best to see to it that the necessary priorities are given to these shipyards in order to stop, now that the emergency has arisen, this flow of manpower away from the yards. I want to commend the exceptionally able work which in my judgment the head of the Manpower Commission office in Portland, Oreg., Mr. L. C. Stoll, has done in this regard. In a letter which I received from him this morning, dated June 2, is a very interesting sentence. He wrote:

You just cannot compete in recruiting workers for the Navy against wage scales paid in private shipyards.

If the Navy is going to be realistic about the matter in my judgment it must recognize that the Manpower Commission cannot meet this emergency unless the Navy makes certain that it eliminates its discriminatory practices, and that there is an equalizing of these ship repair wage rates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the telegrams printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 23, 1945.

L. C. STOLL,

State Manpower Director,

War Manpower Commission.

Following changes made in national production urgency list of May 21—Ship repair establishments—this item is amended to read as follows—"For repair and maintenance of the fleet and for repair and maintenance of all vessels in establishments under allocation from the office of the Coordinator for CWP repair and conversion upon verification by the Coordinator. All west coast shipyards, for repair and maintenance work only, shall be assigned urgency rating No. 1 on a par with the aircraft carriers specified in exhibit D, section 3. Where there is interference with the Manhattan district project, the Manhattan district project shall have preference." Field instruction incorporating changes will be issued shortly.

F. W. HUNTER,  
Regional Director,  
War Manpower Commission.

MAY 23, 1945.

L. C. STOLL,

State Manpower Director,

War Manpower Commission.

The following wire has been sent today by headquarters to all regions excepting regions XII and XI. Reasons for not transmitting to these regions are obvious. "At its meeting Monday the production executive committee accorded a No. 1 urgency rating to various ship repair yards located on the west coast. Yesterday the National Selective Service Sys-

tem granted blanket deferments to electricians, machinists, ordnancemen, instrument repairman, sheet-metal workers, copper-smiths, pipefitters, boilermakers, and riggers employed in these yards. These two actions are indicative of the degree of importance presently attached to the repair of ships disabled as the result of action in the Pacific. Furthermore, it is apparent from reports from most authoritative sources that failure to repair promptly, damage incurred in the Pacific theater, may seriously delay victory over the Japanese. The Navy repair yards are literally filled with ships requiring immediate repair.

The Navy Department is utilizing to maximum capacity the private repair facilities available on the west coast. Manpower must be recruited in sufficient numbers to meet critical requirements for highly skilled workers and a No. 1 priority, second only to Manhattan district recruitment, has been assigned.

At this time only the navy yards located at Mare Island, Hunters Point, and Puget Sound have orders in interregional recruitment. You are urged immediately to exert every possible effort to gear up recruitment for these yards giving full effect to the new priority rating that has been assigned.

Region XII, in an all-out effort to meet repair yards demands, has been recruiting with an emergency category No. 2 rating in bay area, and will recruit throughout region XII with a No. 1 rating in the future. Region XII gives unqualified support to the present needs for the workers in the classifications now in interregional recruitment and states that this demand should not be confused with the general easing of the labor market on the west coast in unskilled categories. When other yards approved with a No. 1 urgency rating enter the interregional recruitment field you will be advised and quotas assigned.

In view of the critical emergency existing on the west coast as the result of recent misfortunes in the Pacific theater we cannot overemphasize the importance of meeting your interregional recruitment quotas.

You will be advised within a few days of the demand for workers which will exist for June and July. Meanwhile your utmost efforts will be expected.

It has been determined administratively feasible to accord all ship repair recruitment not otherwise accorded a priority No. 1 rating nationally, an emergency No. 2 priority rating locally. The latter emergency No. 2 priority rating shall only be accorded recruitment for openings on ship-repair employment and shall be applied to combination ship repair, ship construction establishments only if the establishment has fully applied effective worker transfers from ship construction to ship repair and offers assurance that there will be no diversion of workers to ship construction for workers so recruited for ship repair.

F. W. HUNTER,  
Regional Director,  
War Manpower Commission.

MAY 28, 1945.

L. C. STOLL,

State Manpower Director,

War Manpower Commission.

As you were advised in my multi-teletype of May 23, headquarters has been pressing to remove any and all limitations which may in any way interfere with getting workers to ship-repair yards and returning battle-damaged boats back into action at the earliest possible moment.

To buttress your efforts, we too have been following through and have been in frequent consultation with commander, Western Sea Frontier, and staff, and the United States Civil Service Commission here.

The results of headquarters action were relayed to you in my May 23 wire. Results

of our efforts in the regional office are as follows:

#### PUBLICITY

A. An all-out national publicity program is being prepared. This will feature statements by top Government officials—Army, Navy, War Manpower Commission, others.

B. Relaxation, for the first time, of security regulations which will permit the telling of much of the Pacific battle story which heretofore has not been revealed.

C. Closest possible tie-in between State information representatives and Navy public relations officers, to give fullest possible support to the campaign to staff west coast repair yards.

These programs are in the developmental stage in this writing, with selection of Navy publicity men soon to be named. These officers will work with your public relations staff at the appropriate time.

#### RECRUITMENT

A. The commander, Western Sea Frontier, has proposed to Navy headquarters a plan to use the recruiter organization of the Navy's west coast command construction program. This will mean the employment of some 40 or more experienced recruiters, who will assist the Civil Service and USES in the staffing problem, without interfering with duties, responsibilities, and processes of USCSC and USES.

B. The Under Secretary of the Navy has approved this proposal.

#### WAGES

A. The Navy has agreed to press for wages at the top of the present range so as to achieve maximum competitive position in recruitment for needed skills.

B. Every effort will be made, through strong representations to the War Labor Board, to achieve wage scales that will attract and hold skilled craftsmen.

The Navy requested:

A. That all union officials, of the crafts involved, be fully advised of this program and of the need for concentration of all-out effort on recruitment for, and holding workers in, ship repair yards.

B. Selective Service, unions, and USES work coordinately and intensively on terminations to stop turnover and out-migration to the greatest extent possible. This phase of the program is considered by the commander, western sea frontier, and the Civil Service Commission as being as important as the intensiveness and extensiveness of stepped-up recruitment.

We are continuing to press for a "stretch-out" of maritime and Navy new ship schedules, with the exception of aircraft carriers, and postponement of new work, where possible, in the interests of the main objective of repair.

Please follow through on the items A and B under subject title "the Navy has requested" above and keep us advised of progress. We in turn will keep you posted on all developments in this vital program.

F. W. HUNTER,  
Regional Director, War  
Manpower Commission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the memorandum sent by Paul R. Porter, chairman of the Ship Stabilization Committee, to Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, of the War Production Board, dated March 14, 1944.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 14, 1944.

Memorandum to: Joseph D. Keenan.

From: Paul R. Porter.

Subject: Application of differential for repair work to southern California shipyards.

1. When the original Pacific Coast Shipbuilding Zone Conference was held during



February and April 1941 (at San Francisco and Seattle), zone standards were adopted for new construction only. Concurrently, however, a Pacific coast repair agreement was negotiated directly between the AFL Metal Trades Unions and employers. The Government was not a party to this agreement as it was to the zone standards.

2. At that time no southern California yards under agreement with the AFL were engaged in repair work. No Los Angeles or San Diego yards therefore signed the repair agreement. It seems to have been the clear intent, however, that the terms of the repair agreement would apply in Los Angeles, at least, if and when AFL yards in that port performed repair work, since the agreement specifically refers to Los Angeles as one of the ports in which the agreement will apply. Furthermore, the agreement is consistently described as the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement.

3. Three Los Angeles yards then engaged in repair work—Bethlehem Steel, Los Angeles Dry Dock and Shipbuilding, and Craig—were and are under contract with the CIO. They have not paid the repair differential, though the Los Angeles yard appears to have paid a "dirty work" premium, which also prevailed in AFL yards before it was converted into a specific percentage payment.

4. Whether or not the repair differential would be paid in these three yards has been an unsettled issue for approximately 2 years. Last summer the Los Angeles Dry Dock and the CIO agreed to a repair differential of 11.6 percent. A dispute between Bethlehem (San Pedro yard) and the union was certified to the War Labor Board in April 1942, and was heard by a panel in the autumn of 1942. The panel referred the matter back to the company and the union for collective bargaining. They were unable to agree, and the dispute then went to the Shipbuilding Commission. About the same time the Los Angeles Dry Dock agreement was submitted to the WLB for approval.

5. About this same time a dispute concerning the repair differential between three small shipyards in San Diego and the San Diego Metal Trades Council was submitted on complaint of the San Diego unions to the Shipbuilding Commission. The commission combined these three cases with the two CIO cases—one a dispute, the other a form 10 case.

6. In the meanwhile, the A. F. of L. had signed agreements for new construction with a number of smaller yards in Los Angeles and vicinity. Several of these are also doing repair work. The Los Angeles Metal Trades Council has insisted upon these yards also signing the repair agreement (providing for an 11.6 percent differential). The yards have refused until they were assured of reimbursement from the procurement agencies. The A. F. of L. has asked the procurement agencies to recognize the Pacific coast ship repair agreement as applying to Los Angeles, but have not referred these cases to the War Labor Board.

7. The Shipbuilding Commission sent a division of the Commission to Los Angeles in late October 1943, to hear testimony in the two CIO cases and the A. F. of L. dispute in San Diego. The division recommended against the repair differential in southern California, and the Commission made this its ruling. At the time of the hearing in Los Angeles the Navy, Army, and Maritime Commission submitted a brief strongly opposing the differential.

8. It was universally recognized that the Commission ruling in these five cases would set the pattern for all southern California repair yards.

9. The CIO appealed the Shipbuilding Commission ruling to the War Labor Board. Upon learning of this, John Frey requested that he be permitted to intervene to support the request for a differential. The CIO agreed to his intervening. The WLB ap-

peals committee turned down his request, but this decision was reversed by the WLB. Frey has now requested a hearing before the WLB, and it is assumed that a hearing date will soon be set, but no date has been announced.

10. At this hearing the relationship of the Navy, Maritime Commission, and War Production Board to the repair agreement will probably be one of the major issues in the case. The following paragraphs deal with that problem.

11. The Navy and the Maritime Commission from the beginning regretted that repair work on the Pacific coast had not been brought under the zone standards. In the zone conferences that followed on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and the Great Lakes repair work was included in the zone standards in those zones.

12. When the national shipbuilding conference was held in Chicago in May 1942, the following amendment to the zone standards in each of the four zones was adopted (sec. 3 of Chicago amendments):

"The problem of bringing about the greatest possible degree of uniformity between shipbuilding, ship repair, and ship conversion with respect to overtime and shift premiums shall be referred to zone conferences for determination."

This was regarded by the Government agencies as offering an opportunity to bring repair work on the Pacific coast under the Pacific coast zone standards.

13. A zone conference, in accordance with the foregoing clause, of labor, ship repair employers, and Navy, Maritime, and WFB, was called in San Francisco later that month (May 29, 1942). Only A. F. of L. unions, since their repair agreement differed in various important respects from CIO agreements, were invited on behalf of labor. The CIO shipyard workers were advised that a separate conference would be held later in Los Angeles with their employers, and this was wholly acceptable to them.

14. The San Francisco repair conference adopted five amendments to the Pacific coast ship repair agreement, one of which provided:

"The wage rate for repair work shall be the rate specified for new construction work in schedule A of the Pacific coast master agreement covering new ship construction plus 11.6 percent."

The preamble to these amendments stated:

"A. F. of L. representatives of organized labor, management, the War Production Board, the Navy Department, and the United States Maritime Commission hereby propose to amend as follows the Pacific coast ship repair agreement dated April 1, 1941, at Seattle, Wash., subject to final ratification on approval by the principals of the representatives attending the Pacific coast ship repair conference at San Francisco, which convened May 29, 1942."

The fifth amendment concerning an effective date also provided:

"When ratified and approved by the parties hereto, all the foregoing modifications shall become effective on a date not more than 15 nor less than 30 days from the date on which the parties shall have notified the chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee of ratification or approval and his certification of ratification and approval and his designation of the effective date, as above provided for, shall be final and binding."

No Los Angeles employers participated in this conference, since no yards in which the A. F. of L. was the bargaining agent were then engaged in repair work. The Los Angeles Metal Trades Council did participate, as did delegates from the five local unions in Los Angeles. One of them served on the conference working committee. The propriety of their participation was not raised. Nor was the application or nonapplication of the repair differential to Los Angeles raised. I think it accurate to say that the payment of the

repair differential in Los Angeles A. F. of L. repair yards was assumed by all present. The only conference discussion concerning whether or not the repair differential was universally applicable in the zone was in reference to arguments made against it by small boat builders in the northwest who previously had not paid the differential. Their objections were not accepted by the conference, and they thereafter paid the repair rate for repair work.

Following the conference, I was notified in my capacity as chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee of ratification or approval by the A. F. of L. unions (including the Los Angeles Metal Trades Council), by various shipyards who had participated (but none from Los Angeles), by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, and by Chairman Lund of the Maritime Commission. Mr. Lund verbally approved for WFB.

15. Initially the Government agencies had asked the conference to bring the repair agreement under the zone standards. The conference did not do so, insofar as specifically stating that the newly adopted clauses governing repair work were deemed to be an addition to zone standards. Whether or not, however, the repair amendments became a part of the zone standards in a technical sense, exactly that purpose was accomplished when the three Government agencies became a party to the repair amendments.

The conference action was at that time and for more than a year afterwards firmly regarded by WFB, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission as making them parties to the five amendments to the Pacific coast ship repair agreement. This view was supported by:

(a) The preamble's designation of the three agencies as parties to the agreement;

(b) The fact that the chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee was designated as the person who would be notified of ratification, and who was authorized to proclaim the amendments upon ratification, to be in effect, and whose certification would be accepted by Government, management, and labor as final and binding;

(c) The formal notices of approval from the Navy and Maritime Commission; and

(d) The following excerpts from the official minutes:

(1) From page 4, Minutes of Working Committee, Monday afternoon session, June 1, 1942:

"Mr. Ring reported for the drafting committee. . . . Mr. Ring pointed out that both management and Government representatives of the drafting committee thought that any amendment arrived at at this conference would automatically make the Government a party to the existing agreements insofar as those amended rules were concerned, but that the labor members thought that the amendments arrived at would only change the existing agreement, but did not automatically make the Government a party thereto."

(2) Page 6, same:

"Mr. Wynn (chairman of labor delegation) again raised the question of whether or not the Government would now be a party to the existing repair agreement. Mr. Ring expressed the opinion of the Government representatives that it would be so considered insofar as these parts which would be amended would be concerned."

This ended the conference discussion of the Government as a party to the agreement, with the working (negotiating) committee, as distinct from the drafting committee, accepting the Government position without further question.

During July 1943, at the later Pacific Coast Zone Conference, one of the labor members of the 1942 conference working committee disputed the Government position that it had become a party to the repair amendments. Mr. Frey, who attended the repair conference, holds that the Government

agencies did become a party to the five amendments, and so far as I know has held that view consistently since the conference.

16. A second repair conference for the CIO and the employers with whom it has agreements was held at Long Beach, Calif., in early September 1942. The union requested adoption of the repair differential in CIO repair yards. The employers refused, and the conference adjourned without agreement. At that time the Bethlehem (San Pedro yard) dispute was pending before the WLB. On October 12, 1942, I wrote to the procurement agencies concerning the dispute case as follows:

"It is the opinion of the chairman that if a recommendation is to be made to the National War Labor Board by the Government agencies represented on the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee it should recommend the allowance of payment of the ship repair differential for repair work in the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s San Pedro yard."

On October 21, 1942, Mr. Ring wrote to me: "I am in favor of supporting the recommendations set forth in your memorandum of October 12, 1942, which would apply the 11.6 percent differential to repair work done in the San Pedro area."

Representatives of the Navy Department verbally stated that they believed no recommendation should be made to the WLB, and accordingly, none was made.

17. Recently, the Navy, Army, and Maritime Commission have adopted the view that the Government agencies are not a party to the amendments to the repair agreement, a view contrary to that firmly held at the time the amendments were adopted and for more than a year afterward. When the Shipbuilding Commission held its hearing in Los Angeles last October on the question of the repair differential in five southern California yards, the procurement agencies, without consulting the WPB, filed a brief with the Commission objecting to a repair differential in southern California.

18. The procurement agencies, in taking this independent action, have apparently done so without careful study of the repair conference record or the formal approval of the conference action by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission. From the conference record it seems clear that:

(a) WPB, Navy, and Maritime Commission are definitely parties to the repair amendments, one of which specifies repair rates 11.6 percent higher than new construction rates in the same classifications.

(b) No consideration was given by the repair conference to excluding Los Angeles from the repair amendments; the only consideration of any exception was in reference to small boat builders in the Puget Sound area and this was rejected.

19. No other portion of the repair amendments has been objected to at any time by the procurement agencies insofar as their application to Los Angeles is concerned.

20. The situation described above presents an especially difficult problem for me. It was upon my certification that the repair amendments were put into effect. I certainly would never have certified, as I did on July 14, 1942, that the repair amendments had been ratified without receipt of notices of approval from the Navy and Maritime Commission, because any other course would have been a breach of faith. All parties agreed that my certification would be final and binding. I desire not to embarrass the procurement agencies. But if I am called upon to testify at the War Labor Board hearing, which is likely, I will have no choice except to testify that the Navy and Maritime Commission became a party to the repair amendments.

Mr. MORSE. This record I think at least establishes prima facie evidence, if not controlling evidence, that the procurement agencies were parties to the San

Francisco Conference, and certainly justified the parties to that conference in believing and assuming that the agreements reached were to be uniformly applied throughout the west coast. Thus I call attention to a telegram among this material which will be inserted in the RECORD, known as attachment A. It is dated June 30, 1942, from Mike Stafford, San Francisco, to Paul R. Porter, chairman, Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, Office of the War Production Board, and reads as follows:

Unions affiliated with the following Pacific Coast Metal Trades Councils have unanimously ratified the proposed modifications of both the Chicago and the San Francisco conferences: San Diego, Los Angeles, Eureka, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle. The Bay Cities Metal Trades Council voted 24 in favor of Chicago proposals, 2 unions against both Chicago and San Francisco proposals, and 3 unions favored one proposal and voted against the other proposals but overwhelmingly approved as it concerns the Pacific coast.

That telegram was sent to Mr. Porter who was representing the Government of the United States. It leaves no room for question that certainly the metal trades council was laboring under the impression that the agreement applied to the west coast.

The next telegram is dated Los Angeles, June 30, 1942, as follows:

PAUL PORTER,  
Chairman, Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee;

Seven additional unions affiliated with the Los Angeles Metal Trades Council have voted approval to both amendments recommended at Chicago and San Francisco shipbuilding conferences. All unions having members working in shipyards have voted approval to both propositions.

M. A. KOCH.

Then there is a letter under date of June 9, 1942, from Ralph A. Bard, Under Secretary of the Navy, to Paul R. Porter, chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, War Production Board, Washington, D. C., as follows:

The Navy Department hereby approves the proposed amendments to the Pacific coast repair agreement, dated April 1, 1941, adopted at the Pacific coast ship repair conference held in San Francisco, California, between the dates of May 29 and June 1, 1942.

Then follows a letter under date of June 15, 1942, addressed to Mr. Paul R. Porter, and signed by E. S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, as follows:

DEAR MR. PORTER: The Maritime Commission hereby approves the proposed amendments to the Pacific coast ship repair agreement, dated April 1, 1941, adopted at the Pacific Coast Ship Repair Conference held in San Francisco, Calif., between the dates of May 29 and June 1, 1942.

Then a letter of October 21, 1942, to Mr. Porter from Daniel S. Ring, as follows:

I am in favor of supporting the recommendations set forth in your memorandum of October 12, 1942, which would apply the 11.6 percent differential to repair work done in the San Pedro area.

That is the Los Angeles area. On this occasion Mr. Ring was the representative and spokesman of the United States Maritime Commission.

A memorandum of October 12, 1942, referred to by Mr. Ring in his letter to Mr. Porter. The memorandum was sent by Mr. Porter to Admiral C. W. Fisher, Mr. Daniel S. Ring, and Capt. John J. Lane. Mr. President, in spite of the lateness of the hour, I shall read this memorandum into the RECORD.

OCTOBER 12, 1942.

Memorandum to: Admiral C. W. Fisher, Mr. Daniel S. Ring, Capt. John J. Lane.

From: Paul R. Porter.

Subject: Recommendation for extending repair differential to San Pedro shipyards.

A labor dispute between the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s San Pedro yard and Local 9, IUMSWA (CIO) involving wages and other conditions of work in that shipyard is now pending before the National War Labor Board. A hearing has been held and the panel is about to render its report to the Board. One of the most important issues to be decided is whether the 11.6 percent differential, established by the Pacific coast ship-repair agreement, as amended on May 29, 1942, should be applied to repair work done in the San Pedro area.

The importance of a decision by the National War Labor Board on this issue, insofar as it is closely related to the general program and policy of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, makes it advisable to determine the position of the Government representatives and to examine the advisability of making a recommendation to the National War Labor Board.

The amendments of May 16, 1942, to the zone standards provided for a conference, to be held on the Pacific coast, to bring repair work under the Pacific coast zone standards agreements. On May 29, 1942, a conference convened at San Francisco. Representatives of the governmental agencies, of the AFL unions, and of the shipyards with whom the latter had contracts, participated. A tripartite amendment of the Pacific coast ship repair agreement, relating to the conditions of work in all repair yards having contracts with the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, was adopted. As a result of the conference, a rate 11.6 percent above the standard skilled mechanics rate for new construction was agreed upon, and has been paid.

Representatives of the repair yards and of Local 9, IUMSWA, CIO, in the San Pedro area, were not invited to this conference. The union has requested the same differential be granted to its members as has been allowed to AFL repair workers.

After several postponements, a conference was convened on September 8, 1942, at Los Angeles with representatives of the San Pedro repair yards, the union and the Government. The issue of extension of the differential was to be determined on the basis of a record of testimony taken there. The shipyard representatives opposed extension on the ground that there had never been a difference between repair and new construction in this area. The union demanded the differential since it had been applied elsewhere along the west coast.

In informal discussion among representatives of the Government agencies, the wisdom of extending the differential has been challenged on the ground that—

1. The extension of the differential to the Los Angeles area, where it did not exist by custom, provides a precedent which will be used to justify the establishment of differentials in the other three shipbuilding stabilization committee zones.

2. The application of Executive Orders 9240 and 9250 to the ship-repair industry could well be utilized to reevaluate the zone picture and to entirely eliminate the differential, rather than extend it.

It is the opinion of the chairman that if a recommendation is to be made to the



National War Labor Board by the Government agencies represented on the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee it should recommend the allowance of payment of the ship-repair differential for repair work in the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s San Pedro yard. In that event, a copy of the recommendation, with a statement of the reasons for it, should be supplied to the Bethlehem Steel Co. The opinion of the chairman is founded on the following facts, which may be used as the basis for the recommendation:

1. The Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee program is predicated upon standards which apply uniformly throughout the zones. The operation of the Zone Standards Agreements has not demonstrated a need for the introduction of subzones, nor do grounds now appear to exist which establish the need for subzones.

2. The failure to extend the differential will unsettle labor relations in the area, since the CIO members will consider it an unwarranted preference of the A. F. of L. The potentiality exists, too, that the A. F. of L. may use the discriminatory treatment to create disaffection in the ranks of the CIO.

3. The cost of extending the differential in dollars and cents will be small, since the number of employees affected does not exceed 3,000. The number of repair workers already receiving the differential is many times larger. On the other hand, the potential of mischief that may result from a refusal is large.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say three things:

First, I think it is imperative, if we are to settle the controversy which is raging on the west coast, that representatives of the procurement agencies, representatives of the National War Labor Board, and representatives of the other parties concerned, sit down at an early hour to see if they can reach some agreement as to how this dispute of many months standing can be settled on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Second, I respectfully urge upon the parties concerned that they recognize that if ever we had a case for the application of the rare and exceptional case doctrine, this is such a case. I grant that the doctrine has been used sparingly, and I wish to say in fairness that in decision after decision I have rejected the application of the doctrine where there was a failure to show that the wage sought was absolutely essential in the interest of the war effort. But I cannot imagine a state of facts which would to a greater extent justify the application of the doctrine than the particular facts of this case.

I believe that the hands of the Government are not clean in this case. I think they are not clean partly due to pure innocence and misjudgment. I think it is quite understandable that the workers should have been led to believe that there was to be a great cutback in employment, with the results which we are noting today in the press. Nevertheless, I think there is a great obligation on the part of the Government to proceed without further delay to stop the migration from the shipyards by bringing about immediately an equitable, nondiscriminatory settlement of the issue which is causing so much trouble.

Third and last, Irrespective of what blame may be laid at the door of Government, irrespective of whether or not the decisions in this case to date are sound decisions, the fact remains that

organized labor on the west coast has a great opportunity in this instance to rise to great heights of industrial statesmanship and proceed without further delay to demonstrate to the Government and to the people of the country, as well as to the boys who are fighting the great battle of the Pacific, that its members are going to return to the shipyards in the great numbers needed even before this controversy is settled, to the end that the ships may be repaired at the earliest possible moment.

I am confident that when the problem is presented to the workers in that light they will meet the challenge and return to the yards and see to it that the ships are repaired. But their movement back should not be accepted by this Government as a justification for further laches. It should not be accepted by this Government as justification for the conclusion that the problem has been solved because labor once more has risen to its patriotic duty.

Mr. President, a great injustice is involved in this matter, and there is an obligation on the part of the Government officials concerned to see to it that the basic cause of it, which is the application of a discriminatory principle, is removed from the scene. I have great confidence that if the Government proceeds in good faith, it will find that management and labor on the west coast will see to it that manpower is provided immediately for the repair of those ships.

In closing, I trust that the policy of recrimination and name calling on the part of any governmental official toward labor will cease. It does not solve labor problems. It creates them.

#### EXTENSION OF OPERATIONS OF OPA— FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, filed a report of the committee on the bill extending the operations of the OPA. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has advised me that he desires to file minority views. I ask unanimous consent that he have until 12 o'clock tonight to file the minority views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move in a moment that the Senate take a recess until Wednesday. Before doing so, let me say that after consulting the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is in charge of the pending appropriation bill, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote at an hour not later than 1:15 p. m., on Wednesday, on all pending amendments to the appropriation bill, and that the time be divided equally between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I understand that the requested unanimous-consent agreement refers to the Central Valley project amendment appearing on page 66, beginning in line 19. Are there any other amendments which are likely to be under consideration at that time?

Mr. BARKLEY. There are no other pending amendments, but I understand that the Senator from North Dakota will offer a slight amendment which the Senator from Arizona will accept and will agree to take to conference. Aside from them, I know of no others.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement which has been requested is entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Kentucky is entered into.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, June 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1945:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to act as diplomatic agent of the United States of America at Tangier, Morocco.

## THE JUDICIARY

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Arthur A. Koscinski, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Arthur J. Tuttle, deceased.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES MEDICAL CORPS

## To be colonel

Lt. Col. Henry Stevens Blesse, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 25, 1945.

## To be majors

Capt. Tom French Whayne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 16, 1945.

Capt. Erling Severre Fugelso, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 17, 1945.

Capt. Joseph Garber Cocke, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 23, 1945.

Capt. Alfonso Michael Libaschi, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 25, 1945.

Capt. Ralph Torrey Stevenson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 29, 1945.

Capt. Frank Owings Alexander, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 1, 1945.

Capt. John Benson Grow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1945.

Capt. Daniel John Walligora, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1945.

Capt. Dell Fred Dullum, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Byron Ludwig Steger, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 17, 1945.

Capt. Louie Render Braswell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 19, 1945.

## To be captains

First Lt. John Mark McIver, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 15, 1945.

First Lt. George Thomas Kelleher, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 16, 1945.

First Lt. Samuel Hope Sandifer, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 19, 1945.

First Lt. John Charles Cressler, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 3, 1945.

First Lt. Francis William Lanard, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1945.

First Lt. Louis Axelrod, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 24, 1945.

First Lt. Keith Duane Heuser, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 25, 1945.

First Lt. Thomas Lewis Ozment, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 26, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

## CHAPLAIN

## To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) Elmer Emil Tiedt, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 17, 1945.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1945:

## POSTMASTERS

## TENNESSEE

Cecil G. Bowling, Rockvale.  
Frances D. Thomas, Hickman.  
Fred W. Butler, Pruden.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Lt. Col. Donald C. Stuart, post chaplain, Walter Reed Hospital, offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for these their Representatives in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations; that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. Especially we pray that by Thy guidance these Thy servants may provide in all haste for the successful conclusion of the war and the establishment of a just and abiding peace among the nations of the earth. These and all other necessities, for them, and for us, we humbly beg in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 1, 1945, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of a revised edition of House Document No. 619, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Office of Civilian Defense.
8. Selective Service System.
9. Tennessee Valley Authority.

## CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN SUBSIDY PAYMENTS BY CORPORATIONS UNDER THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

## GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McCORMACK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include short addresses delivered by Mr. W. A. Lloyd and myself at the exercises held when the auditorium of the Department of Agriculture was dedicated in honor of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made on Memorial Day at Arlington National Cemetery by War Mobilization Director Fred M. Vinson.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus Dispatch.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an address delivered by Hon John J. Baker, assemblyman of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a memorandum concerning the authorship of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Jimmie Chappell.



Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on the question of the punishment of war criminals.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an article by Gen. George Rogers Clark. I have a statement from the Public Printer that the cost will be \$121.41, or \$17.34 more than the amount permitted. Notwithstanding that, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Vinson has today released to the press a letter which he had sent to Senator WAGNER pertaining to the bill S. 330, popularly known as the full employment bill. Its counterpart in this House is H. R. 2202, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and cosponsored by 68 other Members.

I hope every Member of the Congress will pay particular attention to the message of Judge Vinson. I believe that the full employment bill is one of the most important in front of us, and I think Judge Vinson deserves the praise of everyone for his fearless stand in favor of that measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

#### THE MYSTERY ABOUT JOSE DEL CASTANO, SPANISH CONSUL GENERAL IN MANILA

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief article by Frank R. Gannett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances, one on the subject of aviation, and a second on the subject of executive agencies and bureaus and the present food shortage, and to include in the second excerpts from a letter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a set of resolutions and in the other an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects, in one to include a statement and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. FULLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a memorial to the President and the Congress concerning the freedom of war refugees temporarily at Port Ontario, Oswego, N. Y.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Harold Hartley, editor of the Toledo Times.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent upon the conclusion of legislative business and other special orders on today, tomorrow, and Thursday, to address the House on each day for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### NIGHT LIGHTING OF THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, over the week end a matter of some urgency took me to New York City. Quite by accident I learned that some of our returning troops if they arrive in New York Harbor at night do not have the chance to see the Statue of Liberty because the lights are turned off. For some reason or other the appropriations do not seem to cover lighting of the statue during the late night or early morning hours.

Surely it is not asking too much that our soldiers returning to New York Harbor be greeted by the sight of that noble symbol of our freedom. If the transport arrives by day it is all right. But likewise, if the transport comes in after hours the servicemen should have the opportunity to see the torch of liberty enlightening the world.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] made an excellent suggestion when he proposed that the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor be floodlighted at any and all hours during the night when transports bearing overseas veterans are entering the port. To millions of men who have undergone the privations of warfare, the first sight of the Statue of Liberty has symbolized in their minds actual return to their homeland. When they arrive at night, as many of them do, a darkened Statue of Liberty deprives them of something for which they have been hungering for months and even years. Let us have Liberty illuminated for these boys.

CAPT. JAMES KIMBLE VARDAMAN, JR., UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### MEMO ON HOOVER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article entitled "Memo on Hoover."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### FRANCE VERSUS SYRIA

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days the American people have been shocked by the ruthless killing of Syrians by the French troops.

France after a decade of political debauchery suffered an ignominious defeat.

Now, before the prison pallor is off her face she is shooting down patriotic and freedom-loving minorities. Oh! where are the "four freedoms."

The Syrian immigrants and their descendants are some of our best citizens. We have supplied the French with about \$1,000,000,000 in lend-lease materials. We were told it was to be used to fight Germany, but now we find our tanks and bombers killing innocent people.

In connection with the incident in the Near East, we learn that the British have 600,000 troops there, and we are reminded that England will receive \$5,700,000,000 in lend-lease this year.

It is about time we take stock of ourselves on lend-lease.

I am firm in the conviction it should be stopped forthwith all over the world except China.

## FINAL VOTE ON BRETTON WOODS BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader about the vote on the Bretton Woods matter, consideration of which is scheduled for this week. I understand a report has only recently been published and also that some Members would like to have a definite date in order to make their own engagements. Can the majority leader tell us when he expects a vote on this matter?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one or two Members have spoken to me about certain Members going to West Point. Of course, that will be tomorrow, but I assume that some might want to remain a little longer than 1 day. As general debate on the Bretton Woods matter is scheduled for 2 days, with the understanding between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member that we will close debate on it before 3:30 on Wednesday, and then proceed under the 5-minute rule, I can see no objection, in the event the bill is completely considered on Wednesday, if agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, to having the actual vote taken on Thursday. I am agreeable to that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is agreeable to me. There will be no roll call on the measure until Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. Accordingly, we make that promise to the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask about any suspensions for today?

The SPEAKER. There are one or two. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMHAM], has one, and there may be another one. However, the bills may be passed by unanimous consent. I do not know whether the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] thinks that the Chair is under promise to recognize him today or not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is that bill?

Mr. RANKIN. It is a bill from the Veterans' Committee which among other things will enable the Veterans' Administration to secure help vitally needed to carry on the work of processing the cases that are piling up in the Veterans' Administration. It will come up later in the day, first by unanimous consent.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to put the House on notice that I will have to oppose the bill to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers, because it will set up two pay scales in the same agency and it will disrupt the morale of the workers in the Government. I think it is bad legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we will pass it all right, regardless of the opposition of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] because it is vitally needed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to insert certain reports and excerpts.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an article on housing in his district.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by a housewife on daylight saving.

## BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to go on record in behalf of the Bretton Woods agreement, H. R. 3314, which will come before the House later this week for action. Because of illness in my family, it will be impossible for me to be here to vote for this bill and I now wish to record myself as in favor of this cooperative effort to stabilize the currencies of the nations of the world.

Also, may I urge the defeat by what parliamentary procedure is possible of the so-called expense allotment of \$2,500 to Members of Congress. I spoke against this proposal on May 10, have voted against it twice in the full Committee, and hope that the House will refuse to permit this form of legislation to prevail at this time.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial and newspaper article.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] having stated last week that if desired the House would meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday and Wednesday, and as a result of our talk, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. McCORMACK. I also talked with the chairman last week. Of course, the understanding was that if either one or both wanted it I would make the request. I have conferred with the gentleman from Michigan and he would like to have the House meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. PATMAN. We are conducting hearings on the OPA and start at 10 o'clock every morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was definitely understood if either or both of them wanted to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday or Wednesday, on either or both days, I would propound the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the necessity for meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan can best answer that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, due to the fact that we thought we would need 2 days in an attempt to get the bill completely out of the way by Wednesday night, so far as general debate and the first reading of the bill are concerned, it is perfectly agreeable to the leadership, as I understand, to meet at 11 o'clock so that we can dispose of the matter in 2 days.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are holding hearings before the Veterans' Committee, in regard to its investigation, trying our best to get through in order to take up the necessary legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Meeting tomorrow at 11 will not interfere with that because the day will be consumed in general debate. It is understood that committees, by unanimous consent, can proceed with their hearings in the afternoon except when bills are being considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that we already have permission to sit, but some members would like to hear some of this debate, and I am sure that the members of the committee that has charge of the bill do not want to speak to empty benches all the time, or virtually empty benches. In calling the House together at 11 o'clock they usually kill an hour by making the point of order that a quorum is not present and forcing a roll call. They call the roll and waste an hour and at the same time disturb the committees that are holding these hearings on investigations or future legislation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. To make a statement for the benefit of the membership in connection with this request that the House meet tomorrow at 11. When the application for a rule on this bill was under consideration representations were made to the committee that more than 2 days of general debate was necessary. The Committee on Rules determined that the controversy was sufficiently important to warrant 3 days' debate. However, the committee's attention was called to the fact that an understanding had been reached between the majority and minority leaders, and the chairman and the ranking member of the committee sponsoring the bill felt that 2 full days of general debate would be sufficient. Upon the basis of the understanding that unanimous consent would be obtained to begin debate at 11 o'clock tomorrow and also at 11 o'clock on Wednesday, if desired, the committee reversed its position and reported the rule with provision for 2 days of general debate. An objection to the request would upset that arrangement, which was participated in and entered into with a view of saving the House 1 full day's consideration of this bill. I trust that no Member will see fit to object to the request.



Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact also that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has suggested that this will be agreeable to him? This is in answer to the gentleman from Texas. It was generally agreed all around that this should be carried out.

Mr. COX. An objection to the request would upset the program and the agreement entered into in good faith.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the majority leader that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been working hard to bring in a bill shortly, and he has called for hearings set at 10 o'clock on both Tuesday and Wednesday. I know that he is very anxious to get through. He has planned this program weeks in advance. I am sure you are going to interrupt his plans unless the committee can sit during that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the committee can sit during general debate, that is understood.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not care to interfere with any arrangement that has been made by the leaders. I am not going to object, but I will point out the situation that is confronting this House right now on the OPA. The OPA expires June 30. If we do not start hearings until next week, at least the extensive hearings we hope to hold, we cannot possibly get that bill through before the 30th of June. Then that gives those who want to get the OPA extended 30 days or 6 months, which would be devastating to the program and devastating to the country, a good excuse to say, "We do not have time to have full hearings. Let us just extend it 30 days or 6 months." We do not want that situation to exist. Therefore, we commenced hearings this morning at 10 o'clock. The chairman said he hoped to continue all this week, although we have Bretton Woods coming up tomorrow, which our committee is handling.

In view of the statement of the gentleman from Georgia and the statement of the majority leader, I am not going to object, but I hope you will keep in mind that the OPA should be extended before June 30 for at least 1 year, not any 6 months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 629—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 281) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 629, current session, entitled "Participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for

Reconstruction and Development," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That 2,000 additional copies of House Report No. 629, current session, entitled "Participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development," being a report of the Committee on Banking and Currency to accompany H. R. 3314, shall be printed for the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXEMPTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY BOARD FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1527) to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 4, strike out all after "203)" down to and including "Congress)" in line 8.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this amendment removes some of the exemptions which were in the bill as it passed the House, so it really is a less liberal bill than it was when it passed the House, and maintains existing law as it is to a greater extent.

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes. It is one of the customary bills which the House has passed from time to time to exempt certain voluntary employees of the war agencies and emergency agencies from the provisions of the Federal Code. As it passed the House, the bill contained a provision exempting them from certain provisions of the law. When it got to the Senate, they thought the exemption was not necessary. Consequently, the bill as it comes back now is a more restricted bill than it was when it passed the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2200, to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### DISCONTINUING CERTAIN REPORTS NOW REQUIRED BY LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2504) to discontinue certain reports now required by law.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 386) to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MASON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that this is a bill that passed the House last year. It seeks to give the officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service the right to make arrests of aliens who are illegally in this country and to deport them. Certainly the gentleman from Mississippi would not want to oppose that kind of bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it state "aliens"?

Mr. MASON. It states definitely aliens who are illegally here.

Mr. RANKIN. Let us hear the bill reported first, Mr. Speaker, and see what it says.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Clerk read the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I want the bill read, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear the bill read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the fourth proviso of the second paragraph of the section entitled "Bureau of Immigration" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1049), as amended (8 U. S. C. 110), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service authorized so to do under regulations prescribed by the Commis-

sioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General, shall have power without warrant (1) to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation made in pursuance of law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, or any alien who is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay for examination before an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service having authority to examine aliens as to their right to enter or remain in the United States; (2) to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States, railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States; and (3) to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, if the person making the arrest has reason to believe that the person so arrested is guilty of such felony and if there is likelihood of the person escaping before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States; and such employee shall have power to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the bill I may say that under the present law an official of the Immigration Service may arrest any person attempting to enter this country illegally, if he actually sees that person doing so; or under the present law he may go on any boat in any waters and search that boat, without a warrant, to see if there are any people there attempting to enter.

Mr. RANKIN. Now right on that point, does not the gentleman think that with the liberality with which they have admitted these people who have floated into this country for the last few years, it is pretty late to be authorizing some of these agents to go out and search vessels? If they really want to get rid of a lot of these aliens who should not be here there is not a man in the House who will go further in that direction than I will. No man will go further than I will to try to stop them from coming in here, but I think you are going far afield when you send agents out to search these vessels without warrants. You do not say whether they are our vessels, whether they are the vessels of friendly nations, or what vessels, but they may go and search them without warrants. I can see some of those agents who have been allowing people to pour in here in the past few years, going out and disturbing a friendly vessel and searching it, as if they were searching for a dangerous alien. I think that bill should come up under the regular rules of the House and be open for amendment.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I wish to say that the bill does not authorize the officials of the

Immigration Bureau to enter vessels and search the same. That is the law now and has been for years.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but you extend that authority. You extend that authority to people who have been, in my opinion, negligent in permitting these aliens to pour into this country for the last few years. I do not think you are helping the situation at all.

Mr. MASON. You are not extending that authority now. It was extended years ago and has been on the statute books for years.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I have a letter from the Department of Justice which states as follows:

One of the bills most desired by us is H. R. 386, giving us authority to arrest in certain cases without warrant. The last time the bill was up, objection was made to it on the ground that it should have gone through the Judiciary Committee, I assume, on the broad general principle that all matters of arrest should properly be considered by that committee. During the discussion on it, the statement was made that the bill originated in the Department and referred by the Department to the Immigration and Naturalization Committee.

That is, of course, not exactly true. A similar bill to this was introduced in the last Congress and was in the regular course of business sent to the Speaker of the House, whose office referred it to the Immigration and Naturalization Committee. We are not concerned with what committee handled it. Technically, of course, under the rule, the Judiciary Committee has lost jurisdiction because it did not follow its objection before the bill was reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Who signed that letter?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Shaughnessy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Shaughnessy would do better if he would look after the Department of Justice and not try to lecture Congress on legislative procedure and tell us what bills should be referred to what committees, which I believe the House is better able to take care of than the Department of Justice at the present time. When we get a new Attorney General, and have a house cleaning of course, we may have some improvement down there; I hope so at least.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman wants to understand—

Mr. RANKIN. I do not care to hear a great long lecture by anybody down in the Department of Justice. If they would discharge their duties as well as the Congress does even I would be better satisfied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIVES AND INHABITANTS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 712) relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subdivision (e) is here added to section 1 of the act entitled "An act to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto," approved February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1234), as amended, to read as follows:

"(e) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who on the effective date of this subdivision (e) are residing in the continental United States or any Territory or insular possession of the United States and who are not citizens or subjects of any foreign country regardless of their place of residence or January 17, 1917."

Sec. 2. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act relating to the immigration and naturalization of certain natives of the Virgin Islands," approved June 28, 1932 (47 Stat. 336), is hereby revived and made fully operative as to natives residing in any foreign country on the effective date of this act, and section 2 of the act cited is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto," approved February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1234), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who have been or may be admitted to the continental United States or to any Territory of the United States, the Virgin Islands of the United States, or Puerto Rico as nonquota immigrants and who are not citizens or subjects of any foreign country, if not ineligible to citizenship, may upon petition and upon full and complete compliance with all other provisions of the naturalization laws be naturalized without making a declaration of intention."

Sec. 4. Clauses (1) to (4), inclusive, of subsection (b) of section 328 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, 1152), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, and has resided in the United States continuously since such entry, or entered the Virgin Islands of the United States prior to July 1, 1938, and has resided in such islands continuously since such entry;

"(2) Is a person of good moral character; and

"(3) Is not subject to deportation, but this clause shall not relate to inadmissibility at time of entry into the Virgin Islands of the United States."

Sec. 5. Clause (1) of subsection (b) of section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, 1161) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"For application for record of registry, \$18, except that no fee shall be charged and collected in the case of an alien applicant who entered the Virgin Islands of the United States prior to July 1, 1938, and has resided continuously in the islands since such entry."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 28 (C) OF IMMIGRATION ACT—DEFINITION OF THE TERM "INELIGIBLE TO CITIZENSHIP"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 390) to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 163;



U. S. C., title 8, sec. 224 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'ineligible to citizenship', when used in reference to any individual, includes an individual who is debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States under section 303 or 306 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140, 1141; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 703, 706), or section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (55 Stat. 845; U. S. C., title 50, App. Supp. III), section 303 (a), or under any law amendatory of, supplementary to, or in substitution for, any such sections;"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MEMBERSHIP OF UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 638) to amend the joint resolution of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute," approved January 27, 1942, is amended by striking out the two provisos contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That (1) the membership dues of the United States payable for any fiscal year shall not be paid unless, during the preceding fiscal year, at least eight other American nations shall have been in good standing as adhering members, and unless the dues paid by such other adhering members for the last preceding year for which such members were respectively obligated to pay dues shall have aggregated at least \$10,000, and (2) the total cost to the United States for any fiscal year, for adhering membership, shall not exceed \$35,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3118) to amend section 100 of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, to grant certain priorities to the Veterans' Administration, to facilitate the employment of personnel by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. HERTER objected.

#### DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT RECORDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 44) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government," approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By adding to section 4 the following paragraph:

"The Archivist may also submit to Congress, together with recommendations of the National Archives Council with respect thereto, and at such times as he may deem expedient, schedules proposing the disposal, after the lapse of specified periods of time, of records of a specified form or character common to several or all agencies that either have accumulated or may accumulate in such agencies and that apparently will not, after the lapse of the periods specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the United States Government."

(b) By changing section 6 to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. If the joint committee reports that any of the records listed in a list or schedule referred to it do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the Government, the Archivist shall notify the agency or agencies having such records in their custody of the action of the joint committee and such agency or agencies shall cause such records to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act: *Provided*, That authorizations granted pursuant to schedules submitted under section 4a of this act shall be permissive and not mandatory."

(c) By changing section 7 to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. If the joint committee fails to make a report during any regular or special session of Congress on any list or schedule submitted to Congress by the Archivist not less than 10 days prior to the adjournment of such session, the Archivist may empower the agency or agencies having in their custody records covered by such lists or schedules to cause such records to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act."

(d) By deleting the numerals "9" and "10" in the last line of section 12 and by inserting in lieu thereof the numerals "10" and "11."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, after the word "under", insert "the last paragraph of."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "4a", and insert "4."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COUNSEL SERVING HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 132 to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to the general counsel of the House Naval Affairs Committee serving under the provisions of House Resolution 154, Seventy-ninth Congress, adopted March 19, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "the general."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have carefully read the report on this bill and it is estimated that such a program would cost from two to three dollars per employee. This would mean an expenditure to be authorized of several million dollars; and, according to the agreement by the unofficial objectors, any legislation authorizing such a large sum will not be approved on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request?

Mr. KEAN. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the situation which exists would not abrogate the policy stated by the gentleman from New Jersey. I believe that will be apparent if I may have the opportunity of explaining to the House the provisions of this bill very briefly.

Mr. Speaker, we are not setting up a health program for the agencies or departments of the Government; we are simply saying that those agencies or departments which desire in the future to set up health programs must come before the Committee on Appropriations of this House before such money can be expended in any such program. We find that the money appropriated by the Congress to an agency or department for use in the operation of that department is diverted for the purposes of a health program and there is no legislative sanction by the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that it is quite correct to say that if a certain department put a health program into effect it would cost between two or three dollars per person, but certain departments have in some instances done so without legislative sanction. Also I think it is important that we realize that with a coordinated health program in the Government and the Congress giving it sanction, we will be able to cut absenteeism from about 7 days a week due to sick leave per year as it now exists in the Government down to 6 or even 5 days, and that in reality would be saving 20,000 full-time workers per year, or even 30,000 full-time workers per year.

We believe this legislation is in the interest of economy to the Government of the United States and I trust the gentleman will not insist on his objection because of an agreement has been made in

reference to no particular sum of money. The Civil Service Commission has reported the bill unanimously. I believe that there is an element here which is not involved in the agreement.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman suggest that some of the departments of Government are carrying out functions contrary to law?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I do, and the gentleman from West Virginia has been one who has joined with other Members, notably the gentleman from New Jersey, in attempting at all times to have legislative sanction for the procedures adopted by the various agencies of Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does this call for a contribution on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it will.

Mr. DONDERO. In what sum?

Mr. RANDOLPH. There is no certain sum to be set because each and every department of Government or agency setting up the program or programs would have to justify the program before the Appropriations Committee. Now there is no such procedure followed and we would have it instituted only after the United States Public Health Service and the Civil Service Commission were in agreement on such program.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any way of ascertaining how much of a contribution this would require on the part of the Government?

Mr. KEAN. I may say to the gentleman that the report states two or three dollars per Government employee. If all the Government agencies went into the program, of course it would depend on the number of employees we had after the war. If there were 3,000,000 employees it would cost seven or eight million dollars.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The present situation as found by the committee is that some of the agencies do not have such programs. They are overlapping in some instances. There is no coordination and there is no one who has to pass on them before they are instituted. If they can get some money out of the Appropriations Committee and put in nurses and doctors, why they do it. There is a good deal of that going on in the Government now. Under the procedure provided in this bill, they would first have to take it up with the Civil Service Commission, they would have to consult with the Public Health Service and decide whether or not they should ask for such service; then they would have to go to the Budget and get a Budget estimate, then they would have to go to the Appropriations Committee, so that control of the amount of money is entirely in the hands of the Congress.

Mr. KEAN. I may say to the gentleman that the objectors when they announced their program, stated that they would object not only to bills that cost

several million dollars but they also said they would object to items that instituted new policies. It seems to me that this bill falls under both categories and for the present I shall have to ask that it go over.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about some of these agencies having doctors and nurses to look after the people, I assume who are ill. Do those doctors and nurses follow along on those 30-day sick leaves that they get or is the attention limited to Washington and the departments here?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is limited to the premises in which the department is located. It is really first aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the employee get a doctor to go with him on one of these recovery trips?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No.

Mr. KEAN. I may say to the gentleman that from their explanation probably this is a meritorious bill, but I believe under the circumstances I shall ask unanimous consent to have the bill passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF BEN HILL COUNTY, GA. FROM WAYCROSS DIVISION OF SOUTHERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA TO THE AMERICUS DIVISION OF THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2668) to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Ben Hill County, Ga., of the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia be, and it is hereby, detached from said judicial district and attached to the Americus division of the middle district of Georgia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CRIMINAL CODE TO PROTECT WITNESSES AND JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2709) to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 633) to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such, an identical Senate bill to the House bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 135 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1113; 18 U. S. C. 241) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 135. Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, shall endeavor to influence, intimidate, or impede any party or witness, in any court of the United States or before any United States commissioner or officer acting as such commissioner, or any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States commissioner or officer acting as such commissioner, or who shall injure any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such court or examination before such commissioner or officer, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or who shall injure any such grand or petit juror in his person or property on account of any verdict, presentment, or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or who shall injure any such commissioner or officer in his person or property on account of the performance of his official duties, or who corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, shall influence, obstruct, or impede, or endeavor to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice therein, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. Section 135a of the Criminal Code (54 Stat. 13; 18 U. S. C. 241a) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 135a. Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, shall endeavor to influence, intimidate, or impede any party or witness in any proceeding pending before any department, independent establishment, board, commission, or other agency of the United States, or in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress of the United States, or who shall injure any party or witness in his person or property on account of his attending or having attended such proceeding, inquiry, or investigation, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or who corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication shall influence, obstruct, or impede, or endeavor to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which such proceeding is being had before such department, independent establishment, board, commission, or other agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which such inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress of the United States shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both."

SEC. 3. Section 136 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1113; 18 U. S. C. 242) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 136. If two or more persons conspire to violate any provision of section 135 or 135a of the Criminal Code, as amended, and one or more of such persons does any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished in like manner as provided by sections 135 and 135a of the Criminal Code, as amended."



The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2709) was laid on the table.

**TO ESTABLISH FIRST WEEK IN OCTOBER AS NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK**

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, may I ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a question? I understand that this bill provides that the President of the United States may request the Governors of States, the mayors of cities, and the heads of other instrumentalities of government to set aside and designate 1 week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Certainly I am in favor of any legislation that will aid the physically handicapped, as I assume every Member of Congress is, but I am wondering what effect it will have on the people during the other 51 weeks of the year if in this particular legislation you set aside 1 week of each year in which stress is given to the physically handicapped. Would there not be a tendency, if you set aside 1 week, for the people to think that they have done everything for the physically handicapped and ignore them for the other 51 weeks. What about the other 51 weeks of the year?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I hope not. The fact that we have a Mother's Day to observe does not cause people to forget about the proper attitude for their mothers on other days of the year. I am sure the gentleman understands that the purpose of the resolution is not to get them to employ these people in that 1 week only. It is to emphasize the great importance to our country and to the physically handicapped people themselves of enabling them to get a hold on life in a normal regular way like other people. That is the aim of the thing. It is to try to emphasize the fact that the physically handicapped people, including, I am afraid, a good many hundreds of thousands of veterans coming out of this war physically handicapped, should be given an opportunity to participate in life as nearly like other people as possible. The whole emphasis of this thing would be to try to have an appropriate observance of the great help that the employers of the country can be to the physically handicapped by giving them jobs in due course.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I notice it refers to physically handicapped people without singling out the veterans. I assume the gentleman has at heart primarily the interest of the veterans in this resolution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to

ask the author of the bill if there is anything in it which will make it possible for these physically handicapped, if they find a job, to take that job without being required to pay a union fee and union dues?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that the bill does not go to that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman not think that the returning veteran who is wounded and who has a job offered ought to be able to take it without having to pay somebody for it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the returning veterans ought to have jobs under the best circumstances that they can get them.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am very much in sympathy with the motive of this resolution, but it so happens that in the month of October we have so many campaigns on for finances for one thing or another. I wonder if you would not have this called more to the attention of the people of this country if you would make it 1 day instead of 1 week so that they would give real emphasis to the welfare of the physically handicapped. If you have 1 week, I question very much whether it will not interfere with many other things that we do.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I have a good answer to the gentleman. For instance, I know of a particular school where blind people are being trained for employment in industry. I believe that over a period of a few days set aside for that purpose very effective demonstrations could be made to show the way in which people trained in that school have been fitted into industry even better than normal-sighted people have done in certain instances. I do not think there is any objection to having a week set aside in order that it might be possible in the various communities in the country to have real demonstrations of the manner in which the physically handicapped people have successfully competed in life.

Mr. RICH. You are going to have so many things that require a week or 2 weeks' time that whether the emphasis will be placed on this being set aside for a week rather than, we will say, for a day, should probably be made a matter of further study.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that that is a matter of judgment, but I believe there are sound reasons for devoting a week to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas there is now, and will be for a long time to come, a necessity for utilizing fully all available manpower in America; and

Whereas the already acute problem of the physically handicapped, who number approximately 23,000,000 citizens, is being augmented not alone by the large numbers of men disabled in military service but also by an approximate average of 1,000,000 persons injured in industry yearly; and

Whereas this problem will be more severe at the conclusion of World War II than at any other period in the history of our country; and

Whereas rehabilitation and placement of the physically handicapped are among the most important problems in our national economy, since, if a means is provided to make many such people self-supporting, wholly, or in part, the entire Nation as well as the individuals in question will be beneficiary; and

Whereas Congress and the Chief Executive, as well as leaders in private industry, have expressed concern and have initiated constantly expanding programs on behalf of the physically handicapped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That hereafter the first week in October of each year shall be designated as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. During said week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers.

The President is hereby authorized and directed to issue a suitable proclamation each year, and the governors of States, mayors of cities, and heads of other instrumentalities of government, as well as leaders of industry, educational and religious groups, labor, veterans, women, farm, scientific and professional, and all other organizations and individuals at interest are invited to participate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all the preamble.

Page 2, line 9, strike out "authorized and directed" and insert "requested."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MAKING PERMANENT JUDGESHIP FOR DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1196) to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENNINGS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

**CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Gila reclamation project, Arizona, to the University of Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Arizona how much land is involved here.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are 80 acres in this tract covered by the bill.

Mr. RICH. This bill gives this land from the Federal Government to the University of Arizona?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right. It has been used as an experimental farm for several years at the request of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. RICH. The Federal Government permits the university to use it now?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; but it is the University of Arizona that is conducting the experimental work for the Government.

Mr. RICH. Is there any consideration for this transfer?

Mr. MURDOCK. No consideration, except that the land must continuously be used by the university for experimental purposes, or it reverts to the Government.

Mr. RICH. If that land is in the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior now and the Department is permitting the university to use it for that purpose, why not just let the university continue to be permitted to use it for that purpose?

Mr. MURDOCK. The University of Arizona is conducting experimental farms in various parts of the State. It would be better if this piece of land were under their full management, as one is near my own home.

Mr. RICH. Who owns the University of Arizona?

Mr. MURDOCK. The State of Arizona.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman wants the Federal Government to give this land to the State?

Mr. MURDOCK. To convey title to the board of regents of the university on a conditional basis.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman wants the Government to give this to the State without any consideration as far as the Federal Government is concerned?

Mr. MURDOCK. No monetary consideration, but the experimental work done there is very valuable to the whole country. It is a piece of work that is going to mean much and more and more in the development of that section agriculturally.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the use of this particular tract by the University of Arizona fits into the reclamation project by showing the crops that can be raised in that particular area. Instead of the Federal Government having a demonstration area, the State will do that work and show the various crops that can be raised there and carry on the experimental work.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman may know that during the past 10 or 15 years we have given the Gila project in Arizona millions and millions of dollars. I do not believe we ought to turn this land over to the State of Arizona without any compensation. I think that is wrong. I believe the State of Arizona, if it wants this land, ought to be able to pay something for it. A fair and just price. I do not think a bill of this kind is right or just. I do not think the gentleman even ought to come in here and ask for it. Some people and some States are always looking to the Federal Government for something of value for no consideration. No wonder we are broke.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania has helped to appropriate some of this money to the great Gila project. Does he want adequate return on the investment? This is not giving anything to the State of Arizona, it is merely providing a tract of 80 acres of land on which the University of Arizona can test out crops. This testing at State expense will add value to all the land in that corner of our country.

Mr. RICH. You took money from the Federal Government to develop this land to make it what it is. Now you want to hand it over to the university. I do not think you ought to do that. I think you ought to arrange with the Department of the Interior to sell his land at a sum that is fair to the Federal Government and fair to the State of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my request, that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I assume that the gentleman seeks further information, and more information than one can give in answer to the questions raised while a bill is before the House on the Consent Calendar. I am sure that I can give that needed information, and I believe the gentleman can obtain it by a careful reading of the report on the Senate bill. I have an identical bill which is H. R. 2048, but I asked the Public Lands Committee of the House to report out the Senate bill in order to save time on this legislation.

As I said to the gentleman a moment ago, this bill gives title for 80 acres of land to the University of Arizona, so long as the university uses this land for agricultural experimentation. This experimentation has already proven very valuable in the agricultural development of the area and gives promise of furnishing untold benefits throughout coming years. The work done by the scientific men of the college of agriculture of the University of Arizona will add as much or more to the value of the surrounding lands in the project as will the engineering works which bring the water to the land. Not only that for the lands of the Gila project, but the experimental work will benefit similar lands in adjoining States to a degree which cannot be calculated.

This great reclamation project, known as the Gila project, is in the midst of Uncle Sam's sun parlor, but was known to the early Anglo-Saxon settlers as the hardest part of the desert to be conquered. The conditions encountered and the problems solved by this experimental farm in Yuma County, Ariz., will apply with equal effectiveness to the Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley in California, as well as other areas in the southwestern section of the United States. Let me state some of the actual facts which have been demonstrated.

Even California fruitmen have found this very area in Arizona highly suited to the growing of grapefruit. In this warm climate, potatoes have been grown in the last 12 months. A phenomenal

growth of alfalfa has been produced on this experimental plot. Within gunshot of this experimental farm, sugar-beet seed and flax seed are now being produced. I don't mind saying that I am of the opinion that even better crops, even strange and unknown crops, may be found to be suitable and profitable for this soil and climate. I hope to see ramie tried out there. I am positive that safflower seed is suitable in that soil and climate. I hope, and should not be surprised to learn, that psyllium will grow luxuriantly on this project. You say you never heard of some of these things? Well, Americans are paying enough for these things produced abroad. If this experimental farm can show that any one of the last three mentioned may be grown on this project, it will be worth more than the Government has already spent on the project to date.

Building this project means more than construction of dams and canals and putting the water on the land. As I see it, carrying on this experimental work is the flowering of the project, capable of giving meaning to it and making possible its wealth-producing power. Surely the gentleman from Pennsylvania will remove all objections when he understands this matter. It is not giving the State or Arizona anything but an opportunity to spend money in such a way as to benefit our State, all Southwestern States, and the entire Nation.

#### AUTHORIZING STATE OF ALABAMA TO LEASE OR SELL CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2416) authorizing the State of Alabama to lease or sell and convey all or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State of the act of March 2, 1819.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee, as a matter of curiosity, why it was that in the organic act of 1819 it was provided that the Legislature of Alabama should never sell or lease all or any part of these salt-spring lands for a longer time than 10 years at any time?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Under the organic act of 1819, grants were made of lands on which there were salt springs. At that time salt was so valuable that the Federal Government did not want anybody to get a monopoly of those particular springs. They were used for a particular community. Those communities were dependent on these little springs. That was done in quite a number of States. This was one of the most valuable things to the frontiersmen at that time.

Mr. KEAN. They were dependent for their table salt on these springs?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. They were dependent for their table salt on those springs. They did not want a monopoly on those salt springs. Conditions have changed now. Salt is still valuable but it is easy to get. For that reason we have eliminated many of these restrictions.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the State of Alabama shall be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to lease or sell and convey, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as the legislature of said State has or may direct, the whole or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State for its use by the act entitled "An act to enable the people of Alabama Territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved March 2, 1819, and to apply the proceeds of such lease or leases, sale or sales, or conveyance or conveyances to such objects as the legislature of said State has directed or may in the future direct.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "has", insert the word "directed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139), giving official recognition to the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I would like to ask the author of the bill or someone in charge whether or not the enactment of this bill would in fact make official the Pledge of Allegiance that has heretofore been used by various patriotic organizations, such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Purple Heart, as well as in many of our schools, the only official Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States that could be used?

Mr. EBERHARTER. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent any other Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Is that the gentleman's question?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is the question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There is nothing in this bill or in the previous act that would make this pledge exclusively the pledge to be used.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But the enactment of this bill will put the Congress on record as making official by designation the Pledge of Allegiance that is now used by the veterans' organizations, the wording of which is set forth in the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is precisely the purpose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This wording in the bill uses the word "republic", instead of the word "democracy", which would place the Congress in the position of stating the proper Pledge of Allegiance to the United States shall use the word "republic", instead of the word "democracy."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I do not think they ever did use the word "democracy."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman is correct, but many people in the United States, including many writers and commentators have always referred to it as "democracy," when as a matter of fact we never have been a democracy. We have always been a republic, and we are now. I wish to commend the gentleman for sponsoring a bill that designates this as a republic under the Constitution, which it properly is.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the gentleman does not get any encouragement as far as this wording is concerned—

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am perfectly aware that the word "democracy" is in no way similar to the Democratic Party, nor is the word "republic" in any way connected with the Republican Party. Both "republic" and "democracy" were in use long before either political party was thought of.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It think it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that section 7 of the act refers to this Pledge of Allegiance as if it were the Pledge of Allegiance. This merely makes it official. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] serves a very useful purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was this not the Pledge of Allegiance that was written by the former Clerk of this House, William Tyler Page?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; it is not. That was the American's Creed which was made the official American's Creed. This has no reference to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That section 7 of the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The following is designated as the pledge of allegiance to the flag: 'I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all'. Such pledge shall be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "the joint resolution" and insert "Public Law No. 623."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Joint resolution to" and insert "To."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "should."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill just passed, I believe the following will be of interest:

I pledge allegiance to my flag,  
And to the Republic for which it stands,  
One nation indivisible,  
With liberty and justice for all.

A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE STORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE PLEDGE TAKEN FROM THE DETAILED NARRATIVE BY FRANCIS BELLAMY, AUTHOR OF THE PLEDGE

At the beginning of the nineties patriotism and national feeling was at a low ebb. The patriotic ardor of the Civil War was an old story. The country was then in a period of dazzling prosperity and the chase for what was called the nimble dollar was most in people's minds. The time was ripe for a reawakening of simple Americanism and the leaders in the new movement rightly felt that patriotic education should begin in the public schools.

I was at that time with the Youth's Companion, of Boston, doing work with James B. Upham, a member of the firm. Mr. Upham felt that a flag should be on every schoolhouse. The Youth's Companion fostered a plan of selling flags to schools through the children themselves, at cost, which was so successful that 25,000 schools acquired flags in 1 year.

Mr. Upham also had a greater scheme, the result of which was that every school in the land on a certain day would have a flag raising, under most impressive conditions. The day was to be Columbus Day, 1892—the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America. Mr. Upham declared that that day should mark a new consecration of patriotism and to that end conceived the national Columbian celebration.

I was made chairman of the executive committee for that work and immediately began to enlist the support of not only the superintendents of education in all the States, but also worked with governors, Congressmen, and even the President of the United States. The result was a universal holiday declared for Columbus Day, 1892, by proclamation of Benjamin Harrison.

Of course, there had to be an official program for universal use in all the schools. It had to be more than a list of exercises. The ritual must be prepared with simplicity and dignity. An ode, rich in feeling and diction was written by Edna Dean Proctor. There was also an oration suitable for declamation.

Of course, the nub of the program was to be the raising of the flag, with a salute to the flag recited by the pupils in unison. That was the nub. There was not a satisfactory enough form for this salute. The Balch salute which ran "I give my heart and my hand to my country, one country, one language, one flag," seemed too juvenile and lacking in dignity. Mr. Upham and I spent many

hours in considering the revision of this salute. Each one suggested that the other write a new salute. It was my thought that a vow of loyalty or allegiance to the flag should be the dominant idea. I especially stressed the word "allegiance." So Mr. Upham told me to try it out on that line.

It was on a warm evening in August 1892 in my office in Boston, that I shut myself in my room alone to formulate the actual pledge. Beginning with the new word allegiance, I first decided that "pledge" was a better school word than "vow" or "swear"; and that the first person singular should be used, and that "my" flag was preferable to "the."

When those first words, "I pledge allegiance to my flag" looked up at me from the scratch paper, the start appeared promising. Then for the further reach: should it be country, nation, or Republic? That was hard. Republic won because it distinguished the form of government chosen by the fathers and established by the Revolution. The true reason for allegiance to the flag is the Republic for which it stands.

Now, how should the vista be widened so as to teach the national fundamentals? I laid down my pencil and tried to pass our history in review. It took in the sayings of Washington, the arguments of Hamilton, the Webster-Hayne debate, the speeches of Seward and Lincoln, the Civil War. After many attempts all that pictured struggle reduced itself to three words, one Nation indivisible. To reach that compact brevity, conveying the facts of a single nationality and of an indivisibility both of States and of common interests, was, as I recall, the most arduous phase of the task, and the discarded experiments at phrasing overflowed the scrap basket.

But what of the present and future of this indivisible Nation here presented for allegiance? What were the old and fought-out issues which always will be issues to be fought for? Especially, what were the basic national doctrines bearing upon the acute questions already agitating the public mind? Here was temptation to repeat the historic slogan of the French Revolution, imported by Jefferson, "liberty, fraternity, equality." But that was rather quickly rejected, as fraternity was too remote of realization, and as equality was a dubious word. What doctrines, then, would everybody agree upon as the basis of Americanism? Liberty and justice were surely basic, were undebatable, and were all that any one Nation could handle. If they were exercised for all they involved the spirit of equality and fraternity. So that final line came with a cheering rush. As a clincher it seemed to assemble the past and to promise the future.

That, I remember, is how the sequence of the ideas grew and how the words were found, on that August night with the cooling Boston sea breeze coming into the window.

I called for Mr. Upham and repeated it to him with full emphasis. He liked it. His colleagues on the Youth's Companion also approved of it, and it was printed in the official program.

XCI—347

That is the story of how these famous 23 words came to be written. In later years the words "to my flag" were changed to "to the flag of the United States of America" because of the large number of foreign children in the schools. This enlargement was probably done with good reason, but it did injure the rhythmic balance of the original composition.

#### ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' CORPS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 804) to authorize certain additional appointments in the Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in initial grades not above the grade of captain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the War Department to issue 250 commissions in the Regular Army, to men now serving as temporary officers in the Army. Inasmuch as we have something less than 700,000 such temporary officers, many of whom are interested in commissions in the Regular Army, and the granting of these 250 commissions would quite likely establish a precedent and system upon which future commissions in the Regular Army should be granted, I feel it should not be considered in this manner.

In the committee a motion to table the bill lost by a tie vote. It was voted out of the committee by a majority of one vote.

For the purpose of securing more careful consideration at which the views of the large number of temporary officers may be taken into account, I object to its consideration at this time.

#### TO ELIMINATE PROVISIONS FOR RETIREMENT OF WING COMMANDERS OF THE AIR CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 612) to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to eliminate provisions for retirement of wing commanders of the Air Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill explain its purpose?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to the higher echelons of the Army Air Corps, officers who are appointed to higher ranks in the Air Corps because of their service. The purpose of the bill is to prevent those who have served shorter periods of time from getting superior rank to those who have had longer service and shown their qualifications by their service. That is the only object of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Why should they not be retired the same as any other officer?

Mr. MAY. The bill provides specifically that any officer who shall have served 4 years as chief or assistant chief of a branch or as commanding general of the General Headquarters Air Force and who may subsequently be retired, shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the

highest grade held by him as such chief, assistant chief, or commanding general; with the proviso that the retirement in that way should not reduce the rank, pay, or allowances which such officer would otherwise be entitled to receive.

It does not change their status as far as retired pay is concerned.

Mr. O'HARA. Is that a specific provision made applicable only to wing commanders?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA. Why should that be?

Mr. MAY. The reason is set forth in a letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. O'HARA. I have not had a chance to get a copy of the bill or the report. Would the gentleman object to its being passed over? Is there any hurry?

Mr. MAY. I believe if the gentleman would allow me to read one clause from the report he would agree to let the bill be considered:

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the accrual of special retirement benefits to officers of the Air Corps who are serving as wing commanders while officers senior to them are serving in higher commands not covered by the existing retirement provisions.

It is simply an effort to make them all equal.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### CREDIT FOR ACTIVE SERVICE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ROTC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 889) to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, so as to authorize credit to students now or hereafter enrolled in the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for military training received while on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or while pursuing a course of instruction in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That under such regulations as the Secretary of War follows: 'Any officer who shall have served 4 years as chief or assistant chief of a branch or as commanding general of the General Headquarters Air Force and who may subsequently be retired, shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade held by him as such chief, assistant chief, or commanding general: *Provided*, That this provision shall not reduce the rank, pay, or allowances with which such officer would otherwise be entitled to retire.'"

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROHIBITING ILLEGAL POSSESSION OF DEVICES FOR RECOGNITION OF SERVICE OF MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2581) to amend the act entitled "An act to



provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant seamen", approved May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors," approved May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. The manufacture, sale, possession, or display of any insignia, decoration, medal, award, or device, or the ribbon, button, or rosette thereof, or any colorable imitation of any insignia, decoration, medal, award, or device, provided for in this act, or the act of April 11, 1942 (Public Law 524, 77th Cong.: 56 Stat. 217), or any Executive order issued thereunder, or Executive Order 9472 of August 29, 1944 (9 F. R. 10613), or section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or in any rule or regulation issued pursuant to any such acts or Executive orders, is prohibited, except as authorized under any such acts or Executive orders, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto. Whoever violates any provision of this section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$250 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SAFEGUARDING RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE OF SHIPS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3267) to further extend the effectiveness of the act approved December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808), as amended (57 Stat. 244; U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 47, sec. 353, note), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "During the period until July 1, 1945, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "During the period ending with the termination of the present wars as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of Congress, whichever is earlier, or until such date prior to such termination as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

#### DEFENSE HOUSING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, to submit a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the act entitled "An act to ex-

pedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman conferred with the objectors on either side of the House?

Mr. LANHAM. I have, Mr. Speaker, and also with the majority and minority leaders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the committee of objectors does not permit any bill to come up which is on the Consent Calendar but not eligible to be called. I would, however, ask the gentleman from Texas to explain to the House the urgency of this bill before we let it go.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to do so.

With the European theater of war closed, so far as hostilities are concerned, and production at many of the plants being decreased, we have available a number of temporary war dwelling units which are vacant and there has been a great urgency in an effort to get distressed families of veterans who are overseas and distressed cases of veterans who have returned to their families, sometimes wounded, the right to occupy these vacant buildings. They are not eligible under the present law for this purpose.

The bill provides the further right of retaining all the restrictions with reference to removal under the law of these temporary buildings, and it provides that some of them may be moved from one place to another if that is necessary to carry out the purpose.

It is also provided, in view of the fact that these are distress cases, that these veterans or their families will simply pay a rental that they are able to pay, although generally speaking the law calls for an economic rental.

I may say further that the bill does not in any way increase the authorization of funds which has already been passed, and any funds necessary will have to be procured under the present authorization and with the approval of the Appropriations Committee.

There are a number of these distress cases. Some of these veterans' families, in cases where the veterans are serving in combat areas overseas, are living in screened-in back porches, and I heard of some even living in renovated chicken coops. There have been a good many evicted from the houses in which they were living through sale of the houses. Many have been evicted from these temporary war units because they were eligible while they were war workers, but ceased to be eligible.

I recall one case in particular that was brought to my attention where the poor wife, shortly before the birth of her baby, had to give up her work and had nowhere to go. So the bill is simply to look after these distress cases. It is to meet only these distress cases that this bill makes provision.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I think it is well to emphasize the fact that the reason why we have these vacancies, particularly out on the Pacific coast where our future activities for the prosecution of the war will take place, is that contracts, of course, have been cut back and we found many immigrant workers have moved away from the locations. We have many, many of these buildings now available, but under the law the administrators are not allowed to let the family of a veteran move in. This gives them permission, and makes it the law, to house these unfortunate people on the Pacific coast, those who have come back from overseas and are on the Pacific coast or the families that are there waiting for the soldier or veteran to go across the Pacific.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. If the National Housing Administration followed exactly what the gentleman has said right now I would have no objection, but the gentleman must realize that the National Housing Administration has put in its own rules, just as it has done in connection with this temporary construction work. They came into my district and are now attempting to build 1,400 temporary homes that are supposed to be wrecked 2 years hence. They are going to move them from Wayne and Inkster next door to the veterans hospital at a cost of three and a half million dollars. That is the thing I do not want to happen in this type of legislation.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, this is not legislation of that character at all. This is legislation that will make these vacant houses available for the distressed families of veterans who are serving overseas and returning distressed veterans and their families. That is the purpose of this bill. We are either going to let these buildings remain idle for a while or we are going to let these people live in them. There are some very pitiful cases that would melt a heart of stone.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to corroborate what the gentleman has said about some of these cases that have been brought to my attention and I am glad that the gentleman's committee has brought this bill in. I hope there will not be a vote against it. It is high time that we make some kind of provision for the cases of these veterans and their families.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It seems to me that what the gentleman so well described has been made more acute by the fact that restrictions have prevented private enterprises from building any houses during the period of the war, so consequently

there is no home or place for those folks to go.

Mr. LANHAM. That is it exactly. If they are able to build private homes, there are some provisions to help somewhat; effort is made to get the materials to do that. We are just trying to look after these awful cases of distress.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the bill ought to pass without a vote against it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that every returning soldier wants a home to go to?

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure. This is merely a temporary provision for these distressed families, because under the law all of these buildings are to be disposed of later so that private capital and private enterprise can resume their normal operations. This housing is of a war-emergency nature.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said. I have letters from wives of servicemen needing living quarters in Arizona as described. I find in Phoenix and Tucson, Ariz., the same tragic instances that he related. I hope the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that these instances are not restricted to any locality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with the national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 42, secs. 1521 et seq.), is hereby amended by adding, after section 404, the following new title:*

**"TITLE V**

**"HOUSING FOR DISTRESSED FAMILIES OF SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS WITH FAMILIES**

"SECTION 501. In those areas or localities where the Administrator shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends and that, because of war restrictions, permanent housing cannot be provided in sufficient quantities when needed, the Administrator is authorized to exercise all of the powers specified in titles I and III of this act, subject to all of the limitations upon the exercise of such powers contained in such titles, to provide housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families who are affected by evictions or other unusual hardships (where their needs cannot be met through utilization of the existing housing supply, including housing under the jurisdiction of the Administrator): *Provided*, That any housing constructed under the provisions of this title V shall be undertaken only where the need cannot be met by moving existing housing and shall be of a temporary character subject to the removal provisions contained in title III of this act: *And provided further*, That the Administrator shall fix fair rentals for housing constructed or made available pursuant to this title V which shall be within the financial reach of families of servicemen and veterans with families.

"Sec. 502. To carry out the purposes of this title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds made available until title I of this act are hereby made available.

"Sec. 503. As used in this title V the term 'families of servicemen' shall include the family of any person who is serving in the military or naval forces of the United States, and the term 'veterans' shall include any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE**

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to the bill (H. R. 336) to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas. This bill was objected to on the call of the Consent Calendar and the objection has now been removed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what that bill does, briefly?

Mr. MASON. Yes. I am sorry the gentleman was not present when we discussed the bill. Under present law the officials of the Immigration Service have the right to arrest anyone that they see trying to enter the United States illegally, or they have the right to go on board ship in our waters and search for anyone who may be trying to enter this country illegally, but they have no right under the present law to arrest an alien who has entered illegally, for the purpose of deporting him, without first securing a warrant. If they take time to secure the warrant they sometimes cannot make the arrest, and this would give them that added right to arrest an alien in this country who entered illegally for the purpose of deporting him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth proviso of the second paragraph of the section entitled "Bureau of Immigration" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1048), as amended (8 U. S. C. 110), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:*

"Any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service authorized so to do under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General, shall have power without warrant (1) to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation

made in pursuance of law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, or any alien who is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay for examination before an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service having authority to examine aliens as to their right to enter or remain in the United States; (2) to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States, railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States; and (3) to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, if the person making the arrest has reason to believe that the person so arrested is guilty of such felony and if there is likelihood of the person escaping before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States; and such employee shall have power to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

**FACILITATING EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION**

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3118) to amend section 100 of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, to grant certain priorities to the Veterans' Administration, to facilitate the employment of personnel by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That section 100 of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, is hereby amended to read as follows:*

"Sec. 100. The Veterans' Administration is hereby declared to be an essential war agency and entitled to priority equal to the highest granted any department or agency of the Government in personnel, service, space, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities. During the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after its termination, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure and employ additional personnel on a full- or part-time basis without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), and the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but with full regard to veterans' preference, and to fix and pay the compensation of such personnel not to exceed the maximum provided for comparable classified positions under such laws, and to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and outpatient treatment purposes by lease, purchase,



or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes: *Provided*, That any person so employed shall have the right to qualify by prescribed competitive examination for civil-service status and the employment of any person not receiving a civil-service appointment shall be terminated not later than 1 year after the end of the war."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman from Massachusetts opposed to the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not like certain provisions in it.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia to 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is brought forward for the purpose of enabling the Veterans' Administration to take care of the men who are coming home from this war wounded, or otherwise disabled. You have heard a great deal of newspaper criticism of the Veterans' Administration. Some of those people have been brought before the committee and questioned carefully.

We are trying to find out what is wrong. There is one thing wrong in the Veterans' Administration, and that is the lack of the power that this bill would confer. I understand that the criticism of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is with reference to permitting the Veterans' Administration to employ people temporarily without going through the Civil Service. If that provision were voted down, it would simply kill any efforts of the Veterans' Administration to meet this emergency. There are many people even here in Washington who are willing to work overtime, who are willing to work at odd hours, who are willing to work at night if necessary, if they can get the temporary employment to help clean up those thousands of cases now piled up in the Veterans' Administration, while the disabled veterans are suffering from the want of this service.

For that reason, we have brought this bill to the floor of the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, without any thought that there would be any objection at all. Since it has been objected to, we are asking for its passage under suspension of the rules.

I can assure you now that being chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is not a pleasant duty at this time. During all these years it has been my object to try to see that the veterans are properly cared for.

That is what we are driving at now. There is no way to get this power conferred upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs except through the passage of this bill. For that reason, the representatives of the administration have come before us in this emergency and asked us to give them this power now. I hope the House will stand by us and pass this bill by a unanimous vote.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, without minimizing in any manner the seriousness of the personnel problems which confront the Veterans' Administration, it is submitted that this proposed legislation is fundamentally unsound, and will do a great deal of harm both within and outside the Veterans' Administration.

The Civil Service Commission has consistently placed at the disposal of the Veterans' Administration all the recruiting resources which it has available. It has at all times shown a complete willingness to pool its resources with the resources of the Veterans' Administration.

And results have been achieved. On March 31, 1945 Veterans' Administration reported its total civilian employment as 58,350. Estimates submitted by the Veterans' Administration to the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending March 31, 1945, indicated a goal of 58,172 employees at the end of the quarter. By the end of April 1945, the total employment in the Veterans' Administration had risen to 60,038.

It is also interesting to note that from January 1944 through April 1945, 43,252 persons have been recruited and placed in the Veterans' Administration, with the entire operation being carried on in accordance with civil-service rules and procedures.

I have heard the statement made from time to time that the Veterans' Administration now has approximately 14,000 vacancies. If this is true, the officials of the Veterans' Administration have failed to file requisitions for all of them, because as of April 30, 1945, the Civil Service Commission had on file requisitions for 7,741 vacancies.

If the bill as proposed should become law, it would have the effect of removing the positions in the Veterans' Administration from the classified service for the duration of the war. Consequently, the Civil Service Commission would be unable to utilize its resources in an effort to assist the Veterans' Administration in meeting its personnel needs.

In other words, the situation now is that the Civil Service Commission and the Veterans' Administration are pooling their joint resources and doing everything possible to recruit the necessary number of people. This bill proposes to turn the Veterans' Administration loose on its own, and to deprive it of the resources which are available through the Civil Service Commission's Nation-wide organization. It would seem to be perfectly clear that such a step would have the effect of retarding rather than facilitating the filling of vacancies in the Veterans' Administration.

Unless the proponents of this bill desire to circumvent the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, it will not, if passed, introduce any more flex-

ibility into the recruiting program of the Veterans' Administration than exists now under the war service regulations. All war agencies have been staffed without recourse to legislation of this kind.

I know that the bill, as drafted, provides that the recruitment by the Veterans' Administration shall be carried on "with full regard to veteran preference."

It is a well-known fact that there never has been and there cannot be any real enforcement of veteran preference except as jobs are kept under civil service. All this bill proposes to do is to let the Veterans' Administration pick and choose as they see fit without regard to the competitive rights of veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

The provision of the bill which would authorize the Veterans' Administration to hire persons at the maximum rather than the minimum of the schedule for a particular grade under the Classification Act is a perfect example of the kind of piecemeal approach to pay matters which creates chaos in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

In considering this section let us keep clearly in mind that it is only in the departmental service here in Washington that the Civil Service Commission has anything to do with the classifying of the jobs in the Veterans' Administration. All jobs in the field service of the Veterans' Administration are classified by the Administrator himself.

If such legislation should pass, it would be difficult for Government as an employer to explain to an employee in one agency why that employee, although placed in the same grade as an employee in the Veterans' Administration, is, nevertheless, receiving less pay.

Also it seems to me that it would be extremely difficult for the Veterans' Administration to explain to one of its own employees who has served, we will say, at grade CAF-5 for a period of time why he should be compensated at the minimum rate of the grade while someone is brought in from the outside and put in the same grade and compensated at the maximum of that grade. If the Veterans' Administration is in any way, shape, or manner back of this legislation, it constitutes an excellent example of a short-sighted personnel program. If they are back of this legislation, they are deliberately sponsoring a program which will be sure to wreck morale within the agency itself. There is no authority in this proposed bill to pay anyone other than the additional personnel which may be procured and employed after the passage of this act at the maximum rate of the grades of the Classification Act. Those who have been serving for a period of time will be rewarded for their service by being paid less money than those who are recruited after the passage of this bill.

The Senate has recently passed, and the Civil Service Committee of this body is considering, a pay bill which, if passed by the Congress and approved by the President, will improve the pay structure of the entire Government. It is clear that any other approach to a problem of this nature is both unsound and unfair.

Measures such as those proposed in this bill never provide a real solution for personnel problems. Before passing this kind of legislation this body should be assured, for example, that everything that can be done has been done in the direction of delegating authority to act in connection with personnel problems to field officers of the Veterans' Administration. Personally I do not believe that such is the case. Many of these personnel problems would be solved if the Administrator would break the Washington bottleneck.

Also, this body should be assured of the fact the Veterans' Administration is giving its field administrative officers the best possible staff help in the personnel field; that it has done everything it can to provide better housing conditions for persons required to live at veterans' facilities; and that it is doing everything possible to provide more adequate transportation facilities for persons who are required to travel a considerable distance in order to work at the veterans' facilities.

A careful exploration of these important phases of personnel administration would, I am convinced, reveal the fact that the Veterans' Administration has not done everything that it can to set its own house in order.

And so, we have before us here a proposal which, if passed, would deprive the Veterans' Administration of the recruiting resources of the Civil Service Commission. Unless it is intended by this law to evade the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, it would not introduce any more flexibility in the recruiting picture than is there right now.

We also have before us a proposal which would give the head of one agency of government the right to completely ignore, in recruiting additional personnel, the pay schedules fixed by the Congress of the United States. Other war agencies with tremendous responsibilities to discharge would be placed at a competitive disadvantage by deliberate action of the Congress of the United States.

We also have before us a proposal which, if passed, would mean that the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration would be hiring new persons at a higher rate of pay than persons would be receiving for comparable work who have been with the Veterans' Administration for a considerable period of time. We would not only create a morale situation as between the agencies of government, but we would also create a morale situation within the Veterans' Administration itself.

This measure is unsound legislation which, instead of solving the Veterans' Administration's personnel problems, would add to them. Instead of resorting to measures of this kind, it is time for the Congress and the head of the Veterans' Administration to make sure that the Veterans' Administration has, in effect, the most progressive personnel program which it is possible to put into operation. In this way, and only in this way, can we be fair to the veterans of this and other wars who look to the Veterans' Administration to carry out in an effective and

efficient manner the policies adopted by the Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. How many of the present employees of the Veterans' Administration are under civil service? Not in number but as to class.

Mr. RAMSPECK. All of them.

Mr. KEEFE. All of them, both in the field and in Washington?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. All of them presently are under civil service and subject to the present Classification Act?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; only those in the Washington office are subject to the Classification Act.

Mr. KEEFE. That is what I wanted to get straight.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. What about those out in the field?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Administrator fixes those pay scales in accordance with Executive order.

Mr. KEEFE. And he further is governed by the qualifications of the civil-service requirements?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; they get the jobs through civil-service examinations.

Mr. KEEFE. But as to the pay of those in the field, that is fixed by the Administrator entirely.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Those in the Veterans' Administration here at the home office are subject to the Classification Act. Do I understand it correctly?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right; and may I show further right while we are on this point, while we are discussing it, some of the differences between the minimum and maximum levels? In other words, in grade CAF-2, which is usual for clerks and stenographers, employees are generally started at \$1,440 a year. The top of that grade is \$1,800. This bill would permit the employment of those people at \$1,800. Then, too, it does not permit the raising of the pay of those already there. When you go on up the scale into the professional grade, for instance, professional grade 2 carries an entrance salary of \$2,600. That goes up to \$3,200. Under that you could have two professional people, one employed last month at \$2,600 and one employed next month under this bill at \$3,200, sitting at adjoining desks doing similar work.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the provisions of the pending bill give to the head of the Veterans' Administration the right to employ personnel between the minimum and maximum salaries of a certain grade as classified by the civil service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right. He can go all the way up to the top.

Mr. KEEFE. Is that right?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. That is what the bill permits.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, provided this bill passes, if I apply to the Civil Service Commission and qualify for a certain position within a certain grade as specified by the Civil Service Commission, the Veterans' Administration or the Director

could fix the salary for me at any point between the maximum and the minimum established by the Classification act?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. But it makes no provision for any change in salary as to those who are already employed by the Veterans' Administration under civil service and who are subject to the Classification Act.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That destroys the common sense of the classification theory; it would destroy every vestige of morale in the Veterans' Administration office here in Washington. It is an unfair method of employing personnel.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. Is it not a fact—I have listened to this discussion here, listened to it carefully, is it not a fact that some of the agencies of the Government are doing just exactly what is attempted under this bill? And in some of the other agencies they are going out on the highways and byways, bringing people in here, paying them high salaries, giving them a high classification, and putting them alongside of people who have worked 3, 4, 5, or 10 years who are getting less money but doing more work?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If any such thing is being done I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that it is being done only in those agencies where Congress has done what this bill proposes to do and has exempted them from the Classification Act.

Mr. PITTINGER. I am told that it is being done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It cannot be done if they are under the Classification Act.

Mr. PITTINGER. Is the pending bill a temporary measure?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it is not limited according to the way I read it, not limited at all.

Mr. PITTINGER. Does the gentleman mean that people employed under the provisions of this bill would maintain that classification as long as they were in the service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what the bill states.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I should like to be specific on that very point. Will these people who are to be employed under the provisions of the pending legislation achieve permanent civil-service status, or are they to be hired as temporary employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I call the gentleman's attention to the language in line 19, on page 2 of the bill, reading:

That any personnel so employed shall have the right to qualify by prescribed competitive examination for civil-service status and the employment of any person not receiving a civil-service appointment shall be terminated not later than 1 year after the end of the war.

To pass this bill means to provide a patronage grab. Once these people are



placed on the rolls, they have that advantage over others and are still given an opportunity to qualify under civil service.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, this gives them a privileged status over all other Government employees who are under temporary wartime civil-service employment and for whom regulations are now being made so that they may qualify for permanent civil-service employment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. It also gives them preference over veterans who return after these employees get on the pay roll.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In the meantime, however, what is the solution for the problem presented by the bill offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I could give the gentleman my idea of the solution of it. The trouble in the Veterans' Administration is in the Washington office. Every small, minute personnel transaction that goes on in the Veterans' facility in your State of Michigan or in Georgia has to clear through the Washington office, which is absolutely absurd. The trouble with the Veterans' Administration is down here on Vermont Avenue. If they will adopt modern methods and modern practice, such as the War Department has used in this emergency, and it is working under the law which the gentleman is trying to repeal here, they can get along very well. General Somervell has over a million employees. He has not been held up at all. The trouble is down here because they make the facility managers and regional managers clear every minor appointment through the Washington office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If we are going to apply this kind of legislation to the Veterans' Administration, then why not apply it to every department of Government? Is there any particular difference in principle?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is not one single difference and, as a matter of fact, you would wreck the whole pay structure in Washington because you would have two pay scales for people doing exactly the same sort of work. It is just not common sense.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this bill passes, is an inefficient man liable to be placed in a position of responsibility?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, there certainly would not be any examination procedure. It would be up to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration as to what tests he applied. He could hire them without any test at all.

Mr. RICH. The fact that we have a civil-service test for efficiency would be practically thrown out the window.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It would be thrown out of the window, yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the interpretation according to the gentleman's understanding, who has made a very informative statement today, that if this bill passes, the head of the Veterans' Administration may employ willy-nilly whom he pleases and fix the salary without regard to civil-service qualifications or civil-service formalities within the pay grade fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Absolutely.

Mr. KEEFE. And as to such an employee so hired without regard to civil-service requirements, such employee after he or she is hired may qualify by prescribed competitive examination and have a civil-service status?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And that qualification takes place after they have been on the pay roll?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, they get on the pay roll, then they say, "You can now qualify for a permanent civil-service status"?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. The services of those who do not qualify are terminated not later than 1 year after the end of the war?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. On this question of allowing these temporary employees to qualify after they have served this brief period which, I understand, is to relieve the very thing that we passed a resolution here setting up a committee to investigate, would they not be merely in the position of having 3 years' experience and training in the department? You would be depriving them of passing a civil-service examination, would you not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would not deprive them of competing with others, but I would not give them a preference over those who are fighting now in the Pacific and who may be coming back here and for whom we are trying to preserve these jobs under the war-service regulations. No one is getting a permanent civil-service status and has not since 1942, but these people would get a preference over those.

Mr. MAY. What are you going to do with the 35,000 veterans who return from the war and who have never been under the civil service? Are you going to say to them that they cannot qualify at the end of their service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, no. They would have exactly the same chance to qualify as they do now. The war-service regulations are still in effect and it gives them a preference over the others who do not get into the Veterans' Administration.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the House why this bill is before the House today and why the Committee on World War Veterans passed it out of committee unanimously. Every member of the House, I am sure, knows what I think of the merit system and obeying the civil-service rules and regulations. I just wish the Civil Service would only obey their own rules and regulations more than they do. I considered the measure very carefully before voting for it. But we have an emergency and must have added personnel at once.

There is one reason, and one reason only, why this bill is before the Congress today and that is to try to save human life. Certainly the veterans should have priority over everyone else. The veterans' hospitals are short of attendants today because they are not paid enough. The nursing staff is short 1,000 nurses largely because of low pay, because the Civil Service has carried them in a sub-professional group. The families of veterans, the wives and orphans of veterans, are not receiving their insurance promptly because, as the head of the insurance section says, they cannot get the necessary stenographers and typists to do the work.

I feel very strongly about this. Only yesterday I visited the West Roxbury Hospital in Massachusetts. I learned that one of the boys that I saw there 3 weeks ago had died; a boy who had to lie flat on his stomach all the time. He had a very gallant war service. He did not die of neglect, but cases of that kind need constant watching and care. It is boys in his condition that particularly need nurses and hospital attendants.

There is also a great need for priorities, which is a part of this bill. Today the Veterans' Administration has priorities second only to the Army and the Navy. I was told at the West Roxbury Hospital that they needed 50 Balkan frames as well as Styker beds for the men with spinal-cord injuries. The only chance of these men to be able to walk again, to earn their livelihood, is being made possible by the use of Balkan frames in order that their arms may become strong again. I saw last night a boy who was in a wheel chair at the West Roxbury Hospital. He was in bed the last time I visited the hospital. His face was radiant. I asked how he was getting along. He said, "Fine, but I get tired running the wheel chair. If I only had a Balkan frame on my bed my arms would be strong." The boys need strong arms for crutches to help them in walking.

These Balkan frames have bars on them so that the men can lift themselves up and move themselves and prevent themselves from having horrible bed sores. And they can constantly strengthen their arms by lifting themselves. Those cases also require constant nursing and care. Because the Veterans' Administration does not have the necessary priorities they have not received the Styker beds or the Balkan frames. Care of the servicemen is just as important after discharge as before. This bill provides equality

to the Army and Navy. More must be done to strengthen the Veterans' Administration. This bill is a stop gap for an emergency. The Grim Reaper does not wait for the passage of complicated legislation. I have steadily maintained that the Veterans' Administration should become a department, with a Cabinet head, a man who can fight for sufficient personnel to carry on the work of the Veterans' Administration. It should have also a permanent medical, surgical, and nurse corps, and other technical personnel. I have introduced numerous bills for that purpose. Do you realize that more than 1,500,000 men had been discharged from the Army before VE-day, and many more since then. Those men and their families need every attention, adjustment of all kinds of compensation, and pension claims. They need an explanation of the operations of the GI bill of rights, of the handling of insurance, of the handling of loans, everything that comes under the GI bill, such as unemployment insurance and educational allowances. It is only justice, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to pass this piece of legislation. It is a temporary measure for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. I believe many discharged veterans will find employment in this way. They may even qualify later upon taking an examination for civil service. I doubt whether there will be more than half a dozen votes against giving General Hines of the Veterans' Administration the necessary personnel in order to carry out the provisions of the legislation that the Congress has passed for the veterans.

There is one other matter that I am going to bring up, and that is the need for personnel in the new Veterans' Administration regional offices and the new medical and surgical clinics that are being started all over the country. It is a very vital bill, in my opinion.

The following letter from Dr. Donald Munro, of the Boston City Hospital, and one of the finest neuro surgeons in the United States, was sent me at my request:

Representative EDITH N. ROGERS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am happy to have the opportunity to express my views about the problems relative to the care and rehabilitation of veterans with wounds of the nervous system. I would like especially to deal with that part of it that has to do with the men who have been paralyzed as the result of a wound or wounds of the spinal cord, even though most if not all of what I have to say can apply as well to the care of men with wounds of the brain and peripheral nerves.

As you know, such patients are usually relegated to nursing homes and chronic hospitals as hopeless invalids. Very many of them have no control of their bowels or bladders with the result that they are soiled or wet and smell all the time. When left to themselves they become hermits and antisocial because of self-consciousness and shame of a condition that neither they nor the doctors appear to be able to help. No hope for ambulation or self-support under any circumstances is ever held out to them. Their morale is nonexistent. Indeed, because of deformities resulting from the nature of the injury, many have not only not been able to get into a wheelchair, but have not even been able to lie flat in bed. Tremendous bed sores, repeated attacks of fever and wasting from kidney infections, compli-

cate all such cases. The ordinary end result in financial bankruptcy for the family and a welcome death for the patient after 2 or 3 years. Because of this an attitude of defeatism relative to this problem in particular and, to some extent, to neurosurgical problems in general has developed. Organizations and their individual members deputed to care for such veterans have tended to do no more than house, wash, and feed the patient. This has already gravely affected the morale of veterans of this present war. Inasmuch as the numbers of such wounded are already rising to tremendous heights, the public at large is also beginning to feel the impact of this point of view by way of the soldiers' friends and families.

It is the obvious duty of the Veterans' Department to deal with and correct this situation. There seems, however, to be good reason to believe that they have already or will shortly find it impossible to do so with their present set-up. I believe that failure to recognize this inability and failure to take immediate steps to correct it will do untold and unnecessary harm and make perpetual invalids out of men that under other circumstances would have been self-supporting. First of all, the attitude of defeatism must be abandoned and one of optimism substituted for it. This is justified because it is now possible by proper care to make all such patients sufficiently ambulatory so that with splints and crutches they can walk short distances, or about the house or on the job, get on and off a toilet, go up and down stairs, attend public performances or meetings and remain as clean, odorless, and dry as a normal person. For longer distances they can use a wheel chair and with proper adjustments can even drive their own automobiles. All this means that given the opportunity they can be made self-supporting again in spite of their paralysis. Since it is the duty of the Veterans' Department to see that these veterans get the kind of treatment that produces this result it behooves every individual member of the department to be aware of this possibility and being aware of it to strive to bring it about in the shortest possible time. This will require regrouping and reorganization within the department, the creation of certain new facilities, and a more efficient use of those already available.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE

In my opinion, before the veterans can be so treated as to be made ambulatory and potentially self-supporting certain administrative changes must be made in the department. The most important of these is to establish an elastic liaison between the armed services—particularly the Army—and the Veterans' Department. This is essential if the flow of the wounded from the Army general hospitals to the veterans' hospitals is to be properly controlled as to rate and timing. Unless such control is established either organization can and probably will be unnecessarily crowded and confused and convalescence prolonged for the soldier. It seems to me to be undesirable for this liaison to be a uniformed one. Such an arrangement would create too much inelasticity. I believe it much better to establish it on a civilian basis making use of what already exists in the Army and creating its counterpart in the Veterans' Department. This is the position of civilian neurosurgical consultant to the Surgeon General. There are three in the Army, one, Dr. Jason Mixer, of Boston, for the north and northeastern area; one, Dr. Claude Coleman, of Richmond, Va., for the southern area; and one, Dr. Loyal Davis, of Chicago, for the western area.

Other competent neurosurgeons should be chosen by the Veterans' Department and appointed, one for each area, and if possible from the same cities that the Army consultants come from. This will permit an accessibility and degree of liaison that would be difficult to duplicate under other circum-

stances. The Veterans' Department appointees should act in close cooperation with their Army analogues. They should be appointed from, and for administrative purposes be attached to, the headquarters of the Department in Washington. They should be responsible only to the Chief of the Department. They should be prepared to implement his policies; to act as liaison officers between him, the patients, and the armed services; make recommendations as to policy only to him and act as the consultative court of last resort, in purely professional consultations or therapeutic disputes. Otherwise, they should have no set duties or time of service remaining subject to call by the head of the Department at any time. They should be paid on a per diem basis and only for time spent while on duty or traveling to and from that duty. They should be allowed to assign themselves to duty, however, if a hospital head in their area asks for help or if they have reason to believe that a situation has developed that requires their attention.

The improvement in the care of the neurosurgical cases and the facilitation of their transfer to the Veterans' Department from Army care through such a proposed arrangement is obvious. Not the least of the other advantages accruing from this arrangement will be the mutual confidence that would replace the suspicion that exists at present about the continuing proper care of these patients when they are considered ready to leave the Army and come under the control of the Veterans' Department. This would arise out of the mutual knowledge that each consultant was competent and free of the bureaucratic restraints that are inherent in a commission either in the armed services or in the Veterans' Bureau. This should be done at once.

#### HOUSING, PERSONNEL, AND EQUIPMENT

Eventually, a number of Veterans' Department hospitals should be designated as neurosurgical centers. The location of each should be carefully picked in relation to its possibility as a teaching center, the availability of supplies, such as splints, its proximity to a neurosurgical consultant, ease of access, and the like. The minimum number of beds should be 50. I suggest that a type center be set up now in Boston, Mass., to serve as a model for the others and that the others be neither located nor set up until experience has been had with this first one.

Such a center must have a trained neurosurgeon in charge. He should be given rank commensurate with his authority and regardless of his age. Under him should be two subordinates, one or more head orderlies, one or more especially trained operating room nurses, a social-service worker, one or more occupational therapists, and either a trained splintmaker or access to an orthopedic shop that is not already swamped with work. There should be a trained nurse anesthetist whose services are reserved exclusively for this department. The services of a clinical laboratory with adequately trained technicians must be available. Associated with him should be a genitourinary surgeon and a physiotherapist. Available to him for close consultation should be a medical man, a roentgenologist, a general surgeon, a plastic surgeon, an orthopedic surgeon, a neurologist, a psychiatrist, and a pathologist. There must be an adequate male and female nursing staff and adequate supplies. If head cases are to be handled there must be an electroencephalographic machine and an operator for it. There should be an operating suite—sterilizing equipment, operating room, supply cabinets, etc.—reserved exclusively for the neurosurgical department. There must be an adequate supply of instruments and special equipment. The house staff should consist of one resident or a resident and assistant resident, depending on the number of beds, and under him a house officer for each 10



patients. Under ordinary circumstances, the resident should be picked from previous house officers and should serve for 1 or 2 years depending on the number of beds. The house officers should have a term of service of 1 year. Shorter terms of service should be made available for older men who wish to take refresher courses. The house officers can be rotated to other services but this would lengthen their total service. It is essential that a teaching connection be set up whereby students are brought into contact with the staff. Only in this way will it be possible to persuade competent doctors to join the house, visiting, and consultant staffs. Finally, there should be a neurosurgical consultant designated by the director of the hospital after consultation with the staff and subject to approval by the area consultant and the Director of the Department. His duty is to act as a guide and stimulant to the various members of the center and on occasions to help out with the more difficult technical problems. He should be adequately paid on a yearly salary basis and be subject to call by the neurosurgeon, the director of the hospital, or the area consultant at any time.

#### PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT

Arrangements should be made whereby any reasonable request for equipment is expedited and the equipment provided without unreasonable delay. In particular, such materials as glass and rubber tubing, irrigator bottles, Balkan frames, splints for patients, and the like—all of which are standard and are now difficult to get promptly—should be made available at once. Failure to do so prolongs the patient's convalescence, impairs his morale, and destroys the efficiency of the department.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE VETERANS' DEPARTMENT

Your suggestion that a Veterans' Department Medical Corps and Nursing Corps or their equivalent be formed and substituted for the present antiquated civil-service provisions is most important and to my mind a change that cannot be brought about too quickly. Any system that permits, as the present one does, the doctors in a department responsible for the welfare of the surgically and medically sick to adopt the attitude that their work ceases and their responsibility towards their patients ends when they have completed 8 hours on duty is inexcusable. Union hours are incompatible with the Hippocratic oath, and any doctor who thus betrays his professional honor is unworthy of the name of doctor. Moreover, any department that countenances such a betrayal on the part of their members has forfeited the right to direct the care of patients. As I understand it, doctors in the Veterans' Department now go to work at 8:30 a. m. and stop work at 4:30 p. m. When they stop they stop completely, an officer of the day taking on the responsibility for the professional care of the patients. This arrangement is incompatible with the employment of a competent medical or surgical staff, because competent men won't work under such circumstances. The conviction by those that consent to work under such conditions that they cannot be dismissed except for gross misconduct, as well as the impossibility of using their imagination or developing their skills under such a system, leads to a total loss of initiative and the atrophy of any real ability that any of these doctors may have possessed when he first entered the service. Good men become mediocre, poor men become liabilities, and the patients are sacrificed to the god of bureaucracy. It is no wonder that the young competent doctor who is either in or about to enter the Army and who has ideals and experience as to the proper care of patients shudders and goes to all lengths to avoid the assignment when he learns that he is to be

detailed for duty among the medical living-dead in the Veterans' Bureau. Only a system of appointment and promotion on the basis of demonstrated merit alone, with the converse of discharge and demotion on the demonstration of carelessness, lack of initiative, and laziness can correct these present evils. I believe that the doctors now in the service of the Veterans' Department should be given 6 months to demonstrate their ability and essentiality to the Department and after that either be given adequate rank and pay for the duties and responsibilities they carry or asked to accept reassignment to duty in the Army or to resign. Their places can be filled by selections from the Army and Navy Medical Corps, who will welcome the opportunity to serve under conditions that approach the realism of competitive civil practice.

I am enclosing herewith a very sketchy outline of the strictly medical requirements that must be set up before patients who have been paralyzed as the result of spinal cord injuries can be properly cared for. I am well aware of the fact that it, as well as the material in this letter, do not contain much detail that must be filled in before the ideas that I have expressed can be brought to full fruition. A start in the direction that both you and I have indicated is long overdue, however, and need not be postponed until the last detail is settled. Indeed, it is better not to make such an attempt. When your corps of medical men and nurses have been set up and a merit system consonant with the best ideals of the care of the patient has replaced civil-service bureaucracy with its preoccupation with hours of work, the missing details will all fall into place of their own accord. I do suggest, however, that to implement that procedure as it relates to one special group of the more seriously wounded, three civilian area consultants in neurosurgery be promptly created and attached as outlined to the Department's headquarters in Washington, and that a model neurosurgical center with the minimal staff and equipment detailed above be created at once at the West Roxbury Hospital outside of Boston, Mass. This will serve as a basis for the creation of similar centers throughout the continental United States. Only in these ways will it be possible to change the defeatist attitude which regards the veterans who have been paralyzed as the result of spinal-cord injuries as invalids who can have no future and who must be permanently housed by the veterans' department, to that more modern and optimistic point of view that regards such a veteran as a surgical challenge and is satisfied with nothing less than discharging him from the care of the bureau in the shortest possible time after making him again able to earn his own living.

Please feel free to make any use of this letter that you may consider appropriate and helpful.

Very sincerely yours,

DONALD MUNRO, M. D.

#### THE REHABILITATION OF VETERANS WHO HAVE SUSTAINED WOUNDS OF THE SPINAL CORD AND CAUDA EQUINA AND THEIR REESTABLISHMENT ON A SELF-SUPPORTING LEVEL

##### 1. THE PROBLEM

To make all veterans who have been paralyzed as the result of wounds of the spinal cord and cauda equina independent, clean, ambulatory, and self-supporting.

##### 2. SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

It is of the numerical magnitude of the problem presented by multiple amputations or peripheral nerve wounds. It is of the social magnitude approximating the neuro-psychiatric problem.

##### 3. THE MATERIAL TO BE DEALT WITH

- Patients with spastic paraplegia.
- Patients with flaccid paraplegia.
- Patients with quadriplegia.

d. Patients disabled because of pain or urinary or bowel incontinence.

#### 4. NECESSARY THERAPY

##### (a) Spastic paraplegic patients

###### Required

1. Cure of bed sores.
2. Control of urinary output by patient.
3. Control of bowel discharge by patient.
4. Substitution of flaccid for spastic paraplegia.
5. Stabilization of legs and body preliminary to mobilization.
6. Application of splints.
7. Reeducation in walking.
8. Psychotherapy, encouragement, etc.
9. Education in a trade.

###### How Accomplished

1, 2, 3, and 4 by dorso-lumbar anterior rhizotomy; by closure of any suprapubic cystostomy fistulae; by stretching the bladder to normal size and training in control of urination by tidal drainage and practice; by training in control of bowel emptying; and, with the aid of penicillin, tantalum wire sutures and sulfonamides, by secondary suture, skin graft, etc., of bed sores.

5, 6, 7. Application of caliper splints with lock knee joints and foot drop plates and if necessary a body brace, followed by training in walking, first in walker and then on crutches.

8, 9. Competent oversight by a physiotherapist and psychotherapist and occupational therapist together with rehabilitation facilities.

##### (b) Flaccid paraplegic patients

###### Required

Same as above with the exception of 4 which is already present.

###### How Accomplished

1, 2, and 3. Closure of any suprapubic cystostomy fistulae; by stretching the bladder to normal size and training in control of urination by tidal drainage and practice; by training in control of bowel emptying; and, with the aid of penicillin, tantalum wire sutures and sulfonamides, by secondary suture, skin graft, etc., of bed sores.

5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. As above under spastic paraplegic patients.

##### (c) Quadriplegic patients

###### Required

Same as under b., Flaccid Paraplegic Patients, with the addition of (10) some mechanical substitute for the paralyzed shoulders, arms, and hands, and (11) stabilization of the neck by proper splinting.

###### How Accomplished

1, 2, and 3. As under b., Flaccid Paraplegic Patients.

5. Unnecessary until 10 has been solved.

6 and 7. See 5 and 11.

8 and 9. As under b., Flaccid Paraplegic Patients.

10. Unsolved.

11. Application of modified Zimmer or other similar splint. Plaster of Paris is contraindicated.

(d) Patients disabled because of pain or urinary or bowel incontinence

###### Required

Same as under (a) Spastic Paraplegic Patients.

###### How accomplished

1. Uncommon complication. When present it is dealt with as above.

2 (a). If the bladder has been denervated; by closure of any suprapubic cystostomy fistulae; by stretching the bladder to normal size by tidal drainage; by the use of a constantly indwelling urethral catheter. This catheter should have its opening at the tip rather than on the side, by having the patient empty the bladder every 3 hours.

During the day the catheter is kept closed with a clamp, the rest of the time by at-

tachment of the catheter to a tidal drainage apparatus at night when the patient is in bed. By training the patient to catheterize himself once a week in a sterile manner, to adjust the catheter so that it remains in place during the week, to set up, take down, clean, sterilize, and operate his tidal drainage apparatus; and by teaching him to obtain and use either solution G or solution M properly.

(b) If the bladder has not been denervated; by closure of any suprapubic cystostomy fistulae; and by stretching the bladder to normal size by tidal drainage. If there is a spinal subarachnoid cerebrospinal fluid block by either measurement of the dynamics or a study of the chemical contents of the cerebrospinal fluid in the presence of any significant bladder symptoms, a decompressive laminectomy over the site of the cerebrospinal fluid block should be performed.

3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. All as under Spastic Paraplegic Patients.

10. Intractable disabling pain should be treated by a decompressive laminectomy if there is a spinal cerebrospinal fluid block present in addition. If there is no block present the doing of a laminectomy will be optional and other methods of relieving the pain can be tried. These will vary with the individual problem.

#### 5. IN GENERAL CHARGE OF PROGRAM

A neurosurgeon. The fundamental problem is neurosurgical, although the work to be done on the various subsidiary problems such as the genito-urinary, the general surgical, the neuropsychiatric, and physiotherapeutic, the occupational therapeutic, etc., can be subcontracted to the various departments involved. General oversight and final determination of the methods and policies to be used should rest in the hands of a neurosurgical specialist.

#### 6. HOUSING AND PERSONNEL

1. This work can only be done in a neurosurgical center or clinic. Attempts to have these patients cared for by general surgeons with only an itinerant knowledge of neurosurgery will not only not succeed but will make bad matters worse and lead to disaster. In particular, the general oversight and the technical requirements of neurosurgical operations on these patients are entirely outside the field of knowledge of a general surgeon or of any surgeon that has not been especially and adequately trained in neurosurgery.

2. Neurosurgical centers where these patients can be concentrated for treatment as indicated above should be set up throughout the United States in the near future.

3. In the absence of such centers permission should be given to transfer these patients temporarily from the hospital where they are being cared for to nearby recognized civilian neurosurgical clinics for all operative procedures and for any of the other treatments that cannot be handled as outlined at the veterans' hospital concerned.

4. A neurosurgeon familiar with the problem of spinal cord and cauda equina injuries should be appointed as a civilian consultant in neurosurgery to the Veterans' Bureau at the earliest possible moment. His duties should be analogous to those of the civilian consultants in neurosurgery to the Surgeon General of the Army. Until neurosurgical centers have been set up or designated for the treatment of spinal cord and cauda equina injury cases, his first duty should be to see that such patients are moved to appropriate civilian neurosurgical centers for their treatment. His second duty should be to establish a liaison with his opposite numbers in the offices of the various Surgeons General so that treatment looking toward eventual ambulation and self-support can be expedited, made more efficient, and carried out cooperatively among the various Government departments involved.

#### 7. EXPECTED RESULTS

No figures are available from any series in which the injury to the spinal cord or cauda equina was caused by war wounds.

In a series of 53 civilian patients (including some bullet wounds) who lived more than 90 days after their injury and whose pathology was all between the second thoracic and second sacral segments or else was a destructive injury of the sacral cord and conus or a compressive injury of the cauda equina, 29, or 54.7 percent, are either ambulant or leading an active wheel-chair life, 24, or 45 percent, are ambulant, and 21, or 37.7 percent, are ambulant and working. They all have full 24-hour control of their bladders and bowels.

Under a therapeutic regime other than that outlined a high (estimated 50 percent or more) percentage of such cases die of sepsis eventually. At best only a few become self-supporting and practically none (with rare exceptions where the individual has unusual courage and determination) become ambulatory.

In another series of 44 civilian patients who lived long enough to leave the hospital alive and whose injuries were all to the cervical and first and second thoracic segments of the spinal cord, 38, or 86 percent, were either well or in a satisfactory condition when investigated from 1 to 15 years after their injury. Eighteen or 41 percent were not only living a satisfactory normal life, but were self-supporting. Twenty or 45 percent were either leading essentially normal active lives although for various reasons were not working, or had died of some unconnected intercurrent disease in the course of such a life.

#### 8. UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

1. The rehabilitation of the patients whose shoulders, arms, and hands are paralyzed.

2. The patient who has a partly transected cord and whose mobilization is prevented by involuntary painful irregular flexor spasms of the lower legs.

#### 9. CONCLUSIONS JUSTIFIABLE ON THE BASIS OF TODAY'S EXPERIENCE WITH CIVILIAN CASES TREATED AS OUTLINED

If he has been properly treated, every patient that has a spinal cord or cauda equina injury and that is intelligent and cooperative, and has the use of his shoulder, arm and hand muscles can be made ambulatory; and can have such control of his bladder and bowel as to sleep through the night without either getting up or getting wet; can carry out ordinary activities throughout the day without soiling himself with feces or having to evacuate his bladder oftener than once every 3 hours, can lead a normal social life and within the limits of his intellectual capacity and the restrictions imposed by the necessary use of splints, braces, and crutches, can earn a satisfactory living at gainful labor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, may I ask the chairman a question? Nothing has been said with respect to the bill that gives the Veterans' Administration authority to purchase or construct or take buildings by condemnation procedure.

Mr. RANKIN. I will answer that question later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] 2 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of this House realize that there are about 100,000 of our servicemen who are eligible for discharge under the point system who are also subject to redraft and reinduction immediately. This situation was a little puzzling to me and I did not know of its existence until it was brought out in the hearings before the War Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. These practically 100,000 men who are eligible for discharge but who may be reinducted are the members of the National Guard who have been in the service from the very beginning of the war. I have not had the opportunity to study this matter properly but expect to go into it further. However, it seems as though the National Guard is placed in a different category from the servicemen in the Regular Army. In a circular issued by the War Department, circular 136, page 3, paragraph 5, section 2, you will find this language:

Action to terminate National Guard status is a prerogative of the State adjutant general and will not be taken by Army discharge authorities.

In section 3 you will find this language:

Enlisted members of the National Guard may be discharged from the Army of the United States as prescribed in the AR 615-360 to 369 series and when so discharged from the Army of the United States such enlisted men automatically revert to National Guard status and come under the control of the adjutant general of the State of origin.

And this is the portion of the section to which I wish to call your special attention:

Such enlisted members upon discharge from the Army of the United States are required to register with the Selective Service within 10 days after discharge unless they are already registered. If already registered they will be directed to report by letter to their local Selective Service boards within 10 days after discharge.

This matter came up for discussion in the presence of General Marshall. General Marshall admitted that they could be reinducted. Of course, he informed us that the Army would under no circumstances accept these men back into service, even though they were reinducted. But that still does not prohibit the local Selective Service boards from reinducting them and causing many of them a waste of time and great concern.

This matter also was discussed by Maj. Gen. John F. Williams when he was testifying on the appropriation for the National Guard, and he, too, stated that they were subject to reinduction.

I have not had the opportunity of discussing this with Selective Service headquarters in Washington and do not know what their attitude is in regard to the matter, but in any event, the fact still remains that they do have the authority and some indiscreet board may go so far as to reinduct some of these men who have been discharged under the point system. In spite of General Marshall's word that the Army would not accept them and in spite of any policy adopted by Selective Service headquarters and



the boards throughout the country. I think it only fitting and proper that these men who have been discharged or who are eligible for discharge under the point system be exempted by law from further service. And, therefore, I have introduced a bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to provide as follows:

No person who has served in the armed forces of the United States during the present emergency and has been honorably released therefrom by reason of total service, overseas, combat, and parenthod credits as evaluated by the head of the department concerned, shall be registered, reregistered, selected, or reinducted into the armed forces under the provisions of this act as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall prevent such persons, when qualified under the law and department regulations, from enlisting or reenlisting in or otherwise voluntarily reentering the military service of the United States.

You will note, of course, that the amendment provides that anyone who wishes to may voluntarily reenlist.

In view of the fact that some of these men are now being discharged and others will be discharged and will be subject to reinduction, I request that the Military Affairs Committee take immediate action on this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi that proposes to exempt employees of the Veterans' Administration from classified civil service. I agree that the civil service does not function in many cases as it should, but this bill is not the correct solution to the problem confronting the Veterans' Administration. No member in this House is more anxious than I am to make proper provision for employment and facilities to take care of the servicemen that are in the hospitals and give every service to which they are entitled, but this legislation will not do it.

The fault is largely with the Veterans' Administration itself. It is completely bogged down in red tape, and regulations, which is the result of its own lack of organization and proper administrative management. This bill gives the Veterans' Administration authority to procure additional personnel without complying with civil-service regulations or requirements and without the necessity of passing any examinations and to pay any salary within the maximum limits of civil-service laws. It will result in having one group of employees that have complied with civil-service regulations and another group appointed outside of civil service receiving maximum pay. One group will be civil service and the other may be political. The precedent established under this legislation will give rise to arguments that the same provisions should apply to the dependency-benefits allotments that are now far behind schedule.

If the Veterans' Administration is allowed to classify and fix salaries under the terms of this bill, I wonder if the 60,000 employees now working in the Veterans' Administration will then be satisfied. This legislation will hamper

the morale of the present personnel of the Veterans' Administration if additional employees are performing similar service and receiving higher compensation. The legislation violates one of the basic and fundamental principles of personnel management, which is that employees should receive equal pay for equal work. I can foresee that within 6 months present employees of the Veterans' Administration will either go to other departments and agencies of the Government or leave and be rehired as emergency employees with higher rates of pay. I agree that Veterans' Administration, along with some other agencies, ought to be given higher priority with respect to personnel service, space, equipment, and supplies, but that can be done under existing procedures. I wish to reiterate that Members of the House who have spoken for economy and efficiency management in government cannot be consistent in voting for this legislation, because it will neither solve the problem for which it is designed nor result in either economy or efficiency.

Information is constantly coming to me regarding the overabundant and excessive red tape that exists in the Veterans' Administration in the processing of veterans' cases. The fault as I see it lies in the maze of red tape devised by the Veterans' Administration itself. I am not aware that the Veterans' Administration has taken any steps to correct these gross inefficiencies and I can safely predict the hiring of additional personnel will not solve the problem, but result in more and more red tape.

The Veterans' Administration has insisted upon having all of the power and authority, for example, in administering the loan functions under the GI bill of rights. A part of these functions could have been delegated to other agencies more familiar with this particular work. For example, the RFC could perform the functions dealing with loans to veterans on small business. The Federal Land Bank or some other experienced agency could handle loans on farms. The National Housing Agency could make loans on homes. If this procedure were followed, it would mean less Government employees and bring about far better, orderly, and more favorable action to the veterans concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not even give the veterans now in the armed forces an equal chance for these jobs. This, for the reason that he cannot even compete for them. The Veterans' Administration can employ veterans or leave them out as they choose. I have always held that so far as it is possible and reasonable to do so, that priorities on all jobs in the Veterans' Administration and connected therewith ought to go to the veterans, but there is no protection whatsoever of any kind to protect the veterans in this respect. The Administration under this bill can employ anyone it chooses and without rules and regulations of any kind.

Personally, I feel veterans should be given greater preference than they now have in making application and qualifying for Government jobs. If we follow this kind of legislation, then the veterans' chances would not be as promising as

they are at present, and they are none too good right now. Wherever a veteran can qualify for a Government job when he comes back, he ought to have it.

I regret this legislation has been brought to the floor under suspension of rules and without notice and with limited debate and only a few Members present to hear the discussion. Members will vote for it believing it will benefit our veterans. In my judgment, it will do the very opposite thing. It will not increase the efficiency of the Veterans' Administration and not protect the veterans in any way. If the Veterans' Administration really needs more assistance it ought to have it and can get it, but this is not the way to go about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. REES] and especially to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] one would think that the Civil Service was fighting this war. They did not discuss the object of this bill, which is to help us take care of the disabled veterans. They were talking about the Federal pay roll.

The gentleman from Georgia took his full 20 minutes, the time allotted to the opposition without yielding a single minute to any other Member, to talk about how this bill would affect people on the Federal pay roll. He did not even refer to the priorities provided for here. He did not even refer to the fact that we need space, and that this gives the Veterans' Administration priority to get it. He did not refer to the fact that we need beds, as the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] said.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] says the difficulty is down here in the Department, and he talks about the War and the Navy Departments. The War Department has the WACS and the Navy Department has the WAVES to help in work of this kind. The Veterans' Administration is being loaded down now because of our casualty lists, which are pouring back here, and does not have the necessary personnel to take care of the work.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] says they are going to pay these employees more money than they are paying the people who are on the pay roll for life. Certainly if you employ somebody for 3 weeks or a month or 3 months or 6 months you are going to have to pay him or her more per day than you would pay somebody who is fixed there for life, who can hold the job for life and then be retired when he reaches a certain age. Certainly you are going to have to pay these temporary employees more.

They say this is not the way to go at it. Oh, where were these Rodericks when we were calling for information on this subject? Men who know about veterans' affairs, men who have spent their lives working on this proposition, came before the committee and urged the passage of this bill.

Talk about the veterans that are coming back wanting jobs, we provide in here for veterans' preference. I tell you right now, the gentleman from Georgia had better begin to exercise himself to bring

about some reforms inside the civil service in this country, and especially in Washington.

This stagnation here in the central office is worse than it is anywhere else in the country, because they cannot get the help. They came to the Veterans' Committee with this plea, we heard their testimony, and everybody that heard it agreed that this bill should pass. Now the gentleman from Georgia gets up and says that according to those three lines they can come in later and stand an examination and stay on the roll at that price. There is nothing in the bill to that effect. They can stand examination and, if they are accepted, their permanent pay scale will be regulated according to law governing the Civil Service.

What we are trying to do now is to take care of these men who are coming back who are disabled from gunshot wounds; who are disabled from shellshock; who are disabled from disease; who are disabled from nervous affliction and other illnesses necessarily incident to this war. We are trying to take care of the men who fought this war. They should come ahead of any civil-service roll or anyone else who is on the Federal pay roll temporarily or for life. We are asking you to pass this bill in order to help take care of these disabled men.

Now, with reference to the hospitals, we are having a great deal of trouble about that. The Army has built some very fine hospitals, and the chances are we can get some space there which will enable the Veterans' Administration to take care of the load for the time being. After this war, many of those hospitals will be transferred to the Veterans' Administration. Some of you are kicking because they are not building hospitals. Why build a hospital here when there is one already built only a few miles away that the Veterans' Administration will have to take over after the war closes? The Veterans' Administration in this instance is doing its best to meet the situation. For that reason they have come to the committee and asked for the passage of this bill.

I do not see how anyone can oppose it, even though it might circumvent temporarily that Ark of the Covenant, known as the civil-service roll.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is the Veterans' Administration trying to use the facilities of the public hospitals in all cities of the land to help take care of these veterans temporarily?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is an effort being made to have clinics at civilian hospitals make examinations to expedite rating of claims cases. The Boston City Hospital is taking a number of veterans. The Veterans' Administration wants to establish a clinic at Boston for the neuro-injury cases, the spinal-cord cases; men who will never have a chance to walk again without careful and continuous training. They need personnel for that. Also the Insti-

tute for the Crippled in New York is taking a number of veterans that are giving Veterans' Administration doctors special courses there.

I would say also the War Department has a great many non-civil-service employees.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

I hope the bill passes without a dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 3118 with an amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Seventeen Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were yeas 53 and noes 19.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 39, not voting 168, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 94]

##### YEAS—225

Abernethy	Cox	Hoeven
Adams	Cunningham	Hoffman
Allen, La.	Curtis	Holmes, Mass.
Andersen,	D'Alesandro	Holmes, Wash.
H. Carl	Davis	Hope
Anderson, Calif.	Deaney,	Horan
Andersen,	John J.	Howell
August H.	Dingell	Hull
Andrews, Ala.	Dirksen	Jenkins
Andrews, N. Y.	Dolliver	Jennings
Angell	Dondoro	Jensen
Arends	Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Doyle	Johnson, Okla.
Auchincloss	Ellis	Jonkman
Baldwin, Md.	Ellsworth	Kean
Barrett, Wyo.	Esaesser	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Elston	Keefe
Bates, Mass.	Engel, Mich.	Kefauver
Biemiller	Engle, Calif.	Kelly, Ill.
Bishop	Ervin	Kinzer
Blackney	Fellows	Kirwan
Bolton	Flannagan	Kunkel
Boykin	Flood	Landis
Brehm	Fuller	Lanham
Brooks	Gallagher	Larcade
Brown, Ga.	Gardner	Lea
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	LeCompte
Buffett	Gibson	LeFevre
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Lemke
Burgin	Gillespie	Lesinski
Eutler	Gordon	Lewis
Eyrne, N. Y.	Gossett	Link
Camp	Graham	Luce
Campbell	Granhahn	Lyle
Canfield	Granger	McCormack
Cannon, Mo.	Gregory	McCowan
Carnahan	Griffiths	McDonough
Case, N. J.	Gross	McGehee
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne, Iowa	McGregor
Chelf	Hagen	McKenzie
Chenoweth	Hall,	McMillen, Ill.
Chipewfield	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Church	Halleck	Maloney
Clevenger	Hare	Manasco
Cole, Kans.	Harris	Mansfield, Tex.
Cole, Mo.	Havener	Martin, Mass.
Colmer	Hendricks	Mason
Combs	Heseltun	May
Cooper	Hill	Michener
Courtney	Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.

Mills	Richards	Sullivan
Monroney	Rizley	Sumner, Ill.
Morgan	Robertson, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Mott	Robinson, Utah	Sundstrom
Mundt	Robison, Ky.	Talle
Murdock	Rockwell	Tarver
Murphy	Roe, Md.	Thom
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Murray, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.	Tibbott
Neely	Rogers, N. Y.	Tolan
Norrell	Russell	Traynor
O'Hara	Ryder	Trimble
O'Konski	Sasscer	Voorhis, Calif.
O'Neal	Schwabe, Mo.	Vursell
Patrick	Schwabe, Okla.	Walter
Patterson	Scrivner	Weiss
Peterson, Fla.	Shafer	Weich
Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Maine	West
Phillips	Smith, Ohio	Whittington
Pickett	Smith, Va.	Wickersham
Poage	Smith, Wis.	Wiglesworth
Price, Fla.	Sparkman	Wilson
Ramey	Spence	Winstead
Rankin	Springer	Wolcott
Reed, Ill.	Starkey	Zimmerman
Reed, N. Y.	Stevenson	
Resa	Stigler	

##### NAYS—39

Baldwin, N. Y.	Geelan	Ludlow
Buck	Hale	Madden
Byrnes, Wis.	Hancock	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Healy	Norton
Coffee	Herter	Outland
Cravens	Hoch	Pittenger
Crawford	Hook	Ramspeck
De Lacy	Izac	Randolph
Douglas, Calif.	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Eberharter	Judd	Rich
Elliott	Kilday	Savage
Feighan	King	Taber
Folger	LaFollette	Woodhouse

##### NOT VOTING—168

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Philbin
Anderson,	Gillette	Ploesser
N. Mex.	Gillie	Plumley
Bailey	Goodwin	Powell
Barden	Gore	Powers
Barrett, Pa.	Gorski	Price, Ill.
Barry	Grant, Ala.	Priest
Beall	Grant, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Beckworth	Green	Rabaut
Bell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rabin
Bender	Hall,	Rains
Bennet, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Rayfield
Bennett, Mo.	Hand	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Harless, Ariz.	Riley
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Bonner	Hart	Robertson,
Boren	Hartley	N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Hays	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Hedrick	Rooney
Bryson	Heffernan	Rowan
Buckley	Henry	Sabath
Bunker	Hess	Sadowski
Burch	Hobbs	Sharp
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Sheppard
Carlson	Huber	Sheridan
Chapman	Jarman	Short
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Sikes
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Clements	Johnson,	Simpson, Pa.
Cochran	Luther A.	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Snyder
Coo'ey	Lyndon B.	Somers, N. Y.
Corbett	Jones	Stefan
Crosser	Kearney	Stewart
Curlley	Kelley, Pa.	Stockman
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Talbot
Dawson	Kerr	Taylor
Delaney,	Kilburn	Thomas, N. J.
James J.	Knutson	Thomason
Dickstein	Kopplemann	Torrens
Domengeaux	Lane	Towe
Douglas, Ill.	Latham	Vinson
Drewry	Lynch	Voroy, Ohio
Durham	McConnell	Wadsworth
Dworshak	McGinchey	Wasielewski
Earthman	McMillan, S. C.	Weaver
Eaton	Mansfield,	Welch
Fallon	Mont,	White
Fenton	Marcantonio	Whitten
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Fisher	Morrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fogarty	Morrison	Wolverton, N. J.
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Wood
Fulton	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gamble	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Gary	Face	Worley
Gathings	Patman	
Gavin	Pfeifer	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.



The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin of Iowa and Mr. Henry for, with Mr. Hollifield against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Stefan.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Floeser.  
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.  
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Grant of Indiana.  
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Weichel.  
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Short.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Beall.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jones.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bennett of New York.  
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hers.  
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Knutson.  
Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Carlson.  
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Bryson with Mr. Eaton.  
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.  
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Gillette.  
Mr. Lane with Mr. Hartley.  
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gamble.  
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Clason.  
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Harness of Indiana.  
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Fenton.  
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Talbot.  
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Winter.  
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Wolverson of New Jersey.  
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. GEELAN changed his vote from "present" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping and a portion of a letter from a constituent.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Judge Vinson.

#### EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration under the Rules of the House of House Joint Resolution 208, making an appropriation for emergency flood-control work, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand an amendment will be accepted striking on page 2 the figures "\$200,000" and inserting "10 percent of the aggregate amount of loans and grants."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I had an understanding with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]

who proposed this amendment, and I have assured him that we would have no objection to including it in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the sum of \$12,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods, and for completion of work begun under the acts entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes," approved, respectively, July 12, 1943, and May 29, 1944.

Sec. 2. Two million dollars of the balance of the appropriation of \$15,000,000 made in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, for 1943 flood restoration loans, is hereby reappropriated and made available until June 30, 1946, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make loans and grants to farmers whose property has been or may be destroyed or damaged by floods in 1945 and to service loans made under such appropriation in connection with the 1943 and 1944 floods: *Provided*, That of such amount not to exceed \$300,000 shall be used for grants and not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural sections of the country have been swept by an unprecedented rainfall over the last few months and there has been a consequent congestion of all water courses, resulting in record-breaking floods extending from the upper Mississippi on the north to the Trinity River on the south and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers on the western coast. In many sections, all-time flood records have been established, with corresponding damage to levees and other flood-control facilities—opening to devastation vast areas of farm lands throughout the country. These areas are, naturally, among the richest in the Nation. They are alluvial soils, in a high state of cultivation, and producing grain and stock urgently needed at this time for the national larder.

The breaching of the levees not only destroys growing crops, livestock, and farm facilities, but opens these areas to further inundation with each recurring rain. Unless the breaks can be repaired promptly, these fields cannot be reseeded for a 1945 crop, and the loss of indispensable food products will seriously affect the national economy at a very critical time.

Of course, the repair and strengthening of works of this character require special machinery, skilled workmen, and

experienced engineering, which the farmers are not able to supply either individually or collectively on short notice. The task is of such magnitude and complexity as to preclude any hope of effective restoration in time to secure 1945 crops by any agency except the Government itself. It is, moreover, because of its wide geographical extent and the fact that much of the flood-control systems involved are originally of Federal construction, a National rather than a State or community problem.

This situation has received national recognition through the press, through the reports of surveys of the Board of Engineers of the War Department, and through legislation repeatedly enacted by the Congress.

Only a week or two ago the House, on the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, passed legislation authorizing an appropriation for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of flood control and protection works damaged by these floods. The bill passed the House by a practically unanimous vote, and I desire to refer at this time to the exposition of the subject, and the discussion of this bill in particular, by the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTINGTON, and by the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN and Mr. BROOKS], and others, when the subject was under consideration by the House at that time.

The purpose of the pending resolution is to provide the funds to carry out the provisions of that bill. As will be noted, \$12,000,000 is provided for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of flood-control works, the work to be done by the Government without charge to the landowner, in order to secure continued crop production this season; \$2,000,000 for loans and grants to farmers whose property has been, or may be, destroyed by floods in 1945; and \$8,055,000 for the construction of flood-control projects in California—an urgent and authorized flood-control project in California for the protection of vital railroads serving west coast military activities.

Under the circumstances, time is the essence of the matter, and if the appropriation is to be fully effective it should be available at the earliest date possible. For that reason consideration of the resolution has been advanced, and is being taken up at this time, in order to facilitate its passage and transmission to the Senate. The Board of Engineers of the War Department have been consulted and fully approve the project, and are in position to act promptly on passage of the resolution.

On the expedition with which the legislation is handled depends the production of large supplies of food products and the protection of transportation facilities to distribution centers and ocean ports for transshipment abroad, in prosecution of the war program.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is all of the work provided for in this bill absolutely necessary to be done at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It must be emergency work; otherwise it does not qualify.

Mr. RICH. Is the Army going to do all the flood-control work except what is specifically reserved here for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Board of Engineers will be in charge of all projects.

Mr. RICH. And it is not going to be let out by contract?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of, yes; the Board of Engineers operate through contracts but they maintain complete supervision of all contracts in every stage of the work.

Mr. RICH. Will that be on a cost-plus basis?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it will be handled as river work has always been handled by the War Department.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to say also in answer to the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is extremely important work. A real emergency. I happened to fly over a good deal of that country, Mr. Speaker, which was inundated. Those levees are wide open now and another flood can sweep right in, covering the same land again. There is no protection at all against floods which may arise this very month and which may again inundate large sections of fertile valleys of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, these poor people in the flooded valleys of the Nation need this help and the Army engineers stand ready to act. I hope this House will immediately pass this bill and thereby send full authority and money to the Engineers with the instructions to begin work at once. There is nothing at all now to hold back the water, and it is vital that the work be attended to and attended to immediately. Every bit of the work under section 1 is handled by the Army engineers and every part of it is very vital and very urgent.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Where is this work to be done? Is it designated in the bill where the work is to be done?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will examine the report he will find on page 2 a list of the rivers and the flood areas with a detailed estimate of the amount to be expended on each one.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I may say is one that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggested.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 15, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "ten per centum of the aggregate amounts actually loaned or granted."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we approve the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Flood control, general", including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, \$8,055,000, and such sum is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question. Where is that money to be spent? Is that to be spent on the same projects listed on page 2 of the report?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The appropriations in section 3 are to carry out an authorization recently made. They are for entirely new work. Three trunk line railroads that are menaced by flood waters from adjacent rivers. They are carrying a heavy war traffic from the interior to the coast. It would be disastrous in the extreme if this traffic were interfered with and this appropriation is being made as a part of the war program. It will all be under the control of the Board of Engineers of the War Department.

Mr. RICH. Is this for the construction of a railroad?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is for protection of railroads now in operation, against the flood waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and these expenditures are to prevent the railroads from being cut by washouts.

Mr. RICH. Is it necessary that the Federal Government spend this money for the benefit of the railroads?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is not spent for the benefit of the railroads. It is spent to keep indispensable traffic moving, in furtherance of the war program.

Mr. RICH. Why is the gentleman justified in recommending section 3?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It carries out the authorization provided by the act of December 22, 1944.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me you could have eliminated that from the bill and you would be \$8,000,000 to the good?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain the gentleman would not want to take the responsibility of cutting off supplies moving to the Pacific area at this critical time.

Mr. RICH. This is not going to the Pacific. This is going down the Mississippi River.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is evidently not familiar with the situation. These railroads are carrying troop trains and war munitions across the continent to California ports for transshipment abroad.

Mr. RICH. It is river transportation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. It is railroad transportation. The purpose is to keep the rivers from overflowing and washing out the railroads, thereby stopping war transportation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 279 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### DISPOSITION OF ALIEN ENEMY PROPERTY

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, VE-day has already arrived and we are well on our way to VJ-day and the end of the war, but, as far as anyone can discern, the administration has yet to evolve a program for the orderly disposition of the hundreds of millions of dollars of alien enemy properties which are now in our possession or for the reimbursement of our citizens for private war losses. The American people have the right to inquire: What is the American policy toward alien enemy property? What are we going to do about it?

More than a year ago, I offered a bill which, if then adopted, would have required, among other things, the cutting off of all enemy claims to seized and frozen assets; the immediate sale of all of such alien enemy properties to the highest bona fide American bidders; the deposit of the funds derived from such sale in the Treasury; the holding of such funds in trust for the benefit of American citizens who have suffered injuries by reason of enemy action. Their claims would be provable in American courts in accordance with Anglo-Saxon justice, not in protracted international negotiations nor before international commissions set up for the purpose.

But to this late date, nothing has been done in respect to my proposal. The Seventy-eighth Congress has expired and, with it, my bill. Today I have reintroduced it. Is it to be acted upon or is it, like its predecessor, to be left to gather dust in a pigeon hole in a committee secretary's office? This, as enemy aliens quietly maneuver to recapture and stealthily make away with their properties while American citizens, victims of Axis might, remain uncompensated for their losses.

Following the First World War, we blundered badly in our handling of this problem. As a result of our indifference and the contrivance of interested parties, over \$100,000,000 of the war claims of our fellow citizens remain unpaid, even to this day.

All we have today to show for our almost criminal mismanagement of what was then a colossal estate—an estate which was then amply sufficient to have satisfied every legitimate claim which might have been then asserted against it—is a \$500,000,000 German gold bond—a bond which is not worth the paper it is printed on.

The American people have a right to inquire as to whether this folly is to be repeated in the days that lie ahead. Are we to again witness a return engagement of this stupid performance of 20 years ago? Cannot the administration make



up its mind in respect to what should be done? The American people have a right to know just why nothing has been done in respect to this great question. Is it possible that this inactivity is due to design?

Mr. Speaker, discouraging though the prospects of immediate action appear to be, it would seem that the State Department has at last awakened to an appreciation of its responsibilities to our fellow citizens who have suffered loss and damage at the hands of our ruthless enemies, for the Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward Stettinius, has recently advised me by letter that he "is in agreement with the basic premise of" my bill, revealing a comprehension of the importance of this matter which, to his honor, let it be said, no other Cabinet official has evinced. From the other officials of Cabinet rank nothing has been heard on this subject for months.

There is no time to lose. The end of the war is upon us. If our Government does not act, and act promptly and decisively, we might just as well prepare ourselves for another scandalous betrayal of those of our fellow citizens who are expecting no more than the assistance of their Government in obtaining reimbursement of their monetary losses resulting from alien enemy wrongdoing, wrongdoing of which they, through no fault of their own, are the victims.

Amazing though the intelligence is, it is reliably reported that Nazi natives of captured German towns and villages are already pestering our commanding officers for information as to where and how they can file claims against the United States Government for damages to their properties resulting from American military action against the retreating German hordes. With these impudent German villagers already taking steps to assert war claims against the United States for bombarding their homes and business houses, it is tragic to observe that absolutely no provision has been made nor a single step taken by the Congress to protect our position or to gain reimbursement for the billions of dollars of private losses which American citizens have suffered at the hands of our Axis enemies. And still that is the American record of utter indifference to their own.

If our fellow citizens who have suffered private losses as a consequence of the war action of our detestable enemies are ever to be made whole, the bill which I have just proposed must be immediately enacted. Delay in defining a program can only result in a dissipation of assets, a lessening of the chances of our injured fellow citizens to recoup the damage they have suffered as a consequence of enemy ruthlessness.

Though the Germans and the Japanese are at war with us and are not supposed to have "friends" in our forums, strange though it may seem, they never lack protectors of their alien interests when protection is needed.

Already we hear their seductive voices in a strangely harmonious chorus, all protesting what they choose to denounce at the confiscation of the private properties of German and Japanese nationals, many of whom have been, as others still are, either in the uniforms of the Axis

or in some related activity, plotting the destruction of our country or the murder of its citizens.

American lawyers, those who feel no compunction in accepting retainers from questionable friends of our country, and college professors, those who for a fee are always ready to plead a cause however shoddy, might well be devoting their talents to a better cause than opposing the enactment of legislation for the relief of their fellow American citizens.

But these ever present special pleaders, like vultures poised to sweep down upon their prey, are standing by with straw in their boots, always eager and ever ready to rush to the aid of those who would have destroyed, if they could have, all of that which right-thinking people hold near and dear.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that this motley crew has made its shady influence felt in high places? Could they have had anything to do with the fastening upon us of the policy of inaction with which we are now so sorely vexed? The American people are entitled to know.

But all this notwithstanding, as between the enemy national, the former owner of these assets, and the innocent American citizen who has been the victim of Axis might, who, Mr. Speaker, has the first claim upon our sympathetic attention? Certainly it cannot be the Hun or the Nip.

If the German Nazi or the Japanese Shintoist feels that he has been made the victim of a situation for which he should not be held responsible, should we not refer him to the government that is the author of his unhappy predicament for the redress which he believes should be his? Or should we refer the innocent American citizen claimant to his long-suffering Uncle Sam for financial reimbursement of his monetary losses resulting from the wrongs for which the Jap and the Hun were alone responsible? Should the American taxpayer always be the goat? In the end, Mr. Speaker, it will be one or the other.

Gladly would our alien enemies shift the responsibility of their wrongdoing to the taxpayers of the country that they once set upon to destroy. But will we willingly accept this responsibility as the authors of our unhappiness go scot free?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to be able to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making, and have had occasion to read quite a bit about the gentleman's work on this particular question heretofore. I certainly think the gentleman is doing a worthwhile service for this Nation in calling attention to the things that have gone on previously with reference to German nationals being able to get back property which this Government has taken into custody. I think it would be well for the Congress to bear in mind that about 80 percent of the property we took over during the First World War finally went back into the hands of the Germans. I am one of those who hopes that the Congress will

not permit such nonsense to recur in the future.

Again I say I believe the gentleman is rendering a very great service by the efforts he has made and is making to see that our Nation does what is sound and right concerning the alien property we now hold.

Mr. GEARHART. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Texas. It is most gratifying to learn of the gentleman's interest in this legislative problem. As he points out, 80 percent of the alien-enemy assets we seized during World War I went back to the Germans, leaving unpaid over \$100,000,000 of American claims. Certainly we do not want that to happen again. And it might well happen if we do not pass the bill I have introduced or, perchance, adopt the resolution to declare an American policy in this legislative field which the gentleman introduced a few weeks ago.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to commend the gentleman also on his bill and his fine statement. I understand the gentleman's bill would permit American citizens who have lost property within the occupied countries of our enemies or elsewhere as a result of the war and due to enemy acts to establish their claims in the courts of the United States and to receive payment out of the seized and frozen assets of the enemy countries. Is that correct?

Mr. GEARHART. My bill provides a rather novel procedure. Instead of anticipating the setting up of an international claims commission to pass upon the claims of our fellow citizens, my bill would open the American courts to American claimants, provide a procedure by which they can convert their claims into judgments in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice; judgments which they can thereafter levy upon the funds on deposit with the Treasury, the funds which have been derived from the sale of alien enemy properties now in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian, or from the frozen assets of enemy countries which are already in the hands of the Treasury.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Even though those assets belong to the citizens of the enemy countries, the responsibility is the responsibility of the governments of those people.

Mr. GEARHART. The first result of the enactment of my bill would be to cut off all claims of alien enemies to these properties, some of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian and others of which have been seized and frozen by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that when those people have caused this country to go to war against them, all of their property that has been seized and that is located in this country, especially, should

remain the property of this country as part payment for the great trouble, expense, and sorrow we have gone to in fighting those countries. I think Germany should pay to the limit of all her resources, at least those that we have in this country.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That, I think, is the American policy, and until the legislation which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] referred to was passed by this Congress some 20 years ago, we had adhered to it throughout the entire span of the history of the United States.

Mr. RICH. That may be the policy now, but we get mighty soft and chicken-hearted after a while and we give up things that we should retain. We should remember our own people and take care of them. It is about time we do that.

Mr. GEARHART. That is exactly the point. As between German nationals and Japanese nationals on the one hand, and American nationals on the other hand, certainly our first responsibility is to the American citizen, our own people.

Mr. Speaker, simple justice and a decent respect for the responsibility which is ours render it imperative that this vexing subject of seized and frozen alien enemy properties be taken up and dealt with by the Congress without any unnecessary delay. If a policy is not determined upon and a procedure providing for the disposition of the seized properties is not set up and placed in readiness before the last shot is fired over there, the administration and the Congress, equally guilty of nonfeasance in respect to this, one of the greatest problems which has arisen since the war began, will merit the condemnation of the country, deserve the censure of an outraged citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, let us have action upon my bill. There is no time to spare. The war might end any day. In the name of those who have suffered through no fault of their own, the many who have been impoverished by reason of ruthlessness of enemy action, the innocent bystander victims of this terrible war, if you please, let us face this issue—and deal with it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the vote was taken on the bill H. R. 3118 a few minutes ago. The gentleman from South Carolina, Representative JOE BRYSON, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative E. C. GATHINGS, and I were attending a funeral. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on that particular measure.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article by William Shirer.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the conclusion of the legislative business, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE FOOD SHORTAGE AND RACKETEERING IN NEW YORK

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when we have been told as we have that this country was capable of producing all of the food needed by our allies, by the hungry people of all other countries, by our armed forces and by our civilian population and when the Congress has given to the administration and its planners, as it has, all the power asked to control prices and production, upon the assurance that they would prevent inflation and see to it that there would be enough for all at reasonable prices, it is a little exasperating to learn, not only that the planners have defeated their announced objective, by their muddling and their own inability to avoid the effects of the laws of supply and demand and of nature, but that the administration permits the levying of unauthorized tribute upon those who would, if not interfered with by red tape, supply us with the needed food.

Notwithstanding the fact that Selective Service was warned that the drafting of so many agricultural workers would result in a lack of production, and that Congress expressly provided for the deferment of such workers who were regularly so employed and who could not be replaced, General Hershey and those who controlled him insisted that local draft boards induct essential farm workers, who were subject to deferment under the Tydings amendment, that time and again Members of Congress repeated that warning to Selective Service, General Hershey, State authorities, and local boards of what would happen, the unauthorized procedure continued and the food shortage is with us.

OPA, by a series of directives and regulations made it impossible for those who produced cattle for the market to supply the needs of all. OPA interfered with the egg market to such an extent and so disastrously that 25,000,000 cases of 30 dozen each became unfit for human consumption. They fooled around with the lard situation and 20,000,000 pounds spoiled. A list of other rules, orders, and directives issued by OPA and which tended directly to bring about a shortage of food, might be lengthened indefinitely.

When the cities recently experienced a scarcity of butter and of meat, perhaps no one became hungry, no one really suffered for lack of food, but beyond any

question many of the residents of the cities were exasperated almost beyond control when they learned from the New York Journal-American of May 21, 1945, as a result of an investigation of one of its reporters, that while the city was in need of butter, beef, and other staple products and while many of its people were turning to vegetables to eke out their scanty diet, teamsters' unions were levying tribute upon produce which was being hauled into the city market by farmers, by those who produced it; that, because of the action of the teamsters, city housewives were unable to get fruit and vegetables which were rotting on the market.

Let me quote from the New York Journal-American of May 21, 1945:

While thousands of New York families, denied meat, poultry, and eggs by the wartime famine, turned to vegetables today for subsistence, thousands of cabbages approached the spoilage state on the curbs of Washington Market.

Hospitals, with their sick in need of the vitamins afforded by fruits, clamored for fresh supplies—yet \$5,000 worth of pineapples, bananas, and mangoes are rotting in a huge trailer truck rushed from Florida, their sale prohibited.

In the same market stands a truck with a cargo of potatoes—the last staple of civilized peoples in the starving countries of Europe. No one can buy them. No one may remove them from the truck to offer them for sale.

#### TAKE IT BACK

The cabbages, the fruit, and the potatoes await the arbitrary pleasure of a group of minor union bosses who demand \$56 in fees for each truckload of produce unloaded.

The drivers, either too poor or unwilling to meet the exaction, curb their trucks and walk away leaving their cargoes to spoil.

Or they are peremptorily ordered to "Take it back where you came from."

From the issue of May 22, I quote the following:

Little or no produce went into the refuse cans in Washington Market today following the New York Journal-American exposé that vegetables and fruits were permitted to spoil in a city verging on famine because of a union's arbitrary demand for a \$56 fee from truck drivers.

Another story from the same paper reads as follows:

Food earmarked for New York is being diverted into other markets because of the embargo placed upon its delivery into the city by union demands, the New York Journal-American learned today.

You may recall that recently, due to a truck drivers strike in the city of Chicago, much of the food transportation of that city was tied up and stores and housewives were unable to obtain food which spoiled in warehouses.

The racketeering carried on by the teamsters union as indicated in the foregoing newspaper articles is possible because of a misconstruction of the Anti-racketeering Act of June 18, 1934, as passed by Congress.

When the teamsters of New York were requiring the drivers of all large over-the-road trucks to pay \$9.42 and all over-the-road small trucks to pay \$8.41 when they attempted to enter the city of New York with merchandise or produce, the United States Supreme Court in an opinion handed down on March 2, 1942, held



that inasmuch as the antiracketeering statute exempted from punishment any person who "obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of, or attempt to use, of threat to use force, violence, or coercion, the payment of wages by a bona-fide employer to a bona-fide employee," members of unions were entitled to practice extortion.

To reach this absurd conclusion the Court held that the practice of the teamsters union of levying tribute upon transportation was an established union practice and further held that "Congress intended that these activities should be excepted from the prohibitions of this particular act."

Of the effect of this decision Mr. Chief Justice Stone, dissenting, among other things said:

Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Antiracketeering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, \$9.42 for a large truck and \$8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the trucks and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid, without rendering or offering to render any service.

The Antiracketeering Act condemns the obtaining or conspiracy to obtain the payment of money or delivery of property by "the use of \* \* \* force, violence, or coercion." \* \* \* To this definition of the offense Congress added two, and only two, qualifications. It does not embrace the "payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee" and the provisions of the act are not to be applied so as to "affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States."

There is abundant evidence in the record from which the jury could have concluded that respondents, or some of them, conspired to compel by force and violence the truck drivers or their employers to pay the sums of money to respondents or some of them; that the payments were made by the drivers or truck owners to purchase immunity from the violence of respondents and for no other reason; and that this was the end knowingly sought by respondents.

I can only conclude that such conduct accomplished by such a purpose constitutes a violation of the statute even though the defendants stood ready to unload the trucks in the event that they were hired to do so. Unless the language of the statute is to be disregarded, one who has rejected the proffered service and pays money only in order to purchase immunity from violence is not a bona fide employer and is not paying the extorted money as wages. The character of what the drivers or owners did and intended to do—pay money to avoid a beating—was not altered by the willingness of the payee to accept as wages for services rendered what he in fact intentionally exacted from the driver or owner as the purchase price of immunity from assault, and what he intended so to exact whether the proffered services were accepted or not. It is no answer to say that the guilt of a defendant is personal and cannot be made to depend upon the acts and intention of another. Such an answer if valid would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime. For there can be no rob-

bery unless the purpose of the victim in handing over the money is to avoid force. Precisely as under the present statute, the robber's use of force and its intended effect on the victim are essential elements of the crime both of which the prosecutor must prove. Under this statute when both are present the crime is complete, irrespective of other motives which may actuate the offender, if he is also aware, as we must take it the jury found, that the money is not in fact paid as wages by a bona fide employer. It is a contradiction in terms to say that the payment of money forcibly extorted by a payee who is in any case a lawbreaker, and paid only to secure immunity from violence, without establishment of an employment relationship or the rendering of services, is a good faith payment or receipt of wages.

To overthrow that decision and to end the practice for which there was no justification, either in law or in morals, within 2 days after it was rendered, I offered an amendment to that act, striking out the language of the exception upon which the majority of the Court relied. Nothing came of that amendment. Apparently it was altogether too simple to merit the attention of the House Committee on the Judiciary, but that committee did report out the so-called Hobbs bill which would have ended the practice of racketeering of that type, insofar as Federal legislation can accomplish that purpose.

That bill passed the House by a substantial majority but it died in the other body because of the refusal or neglect of that body to give it consideration and the practice as shown by the news articles above referred to has gone merrily along.

On January 3 of this year the Hobbs bill was reintroduced. It was reported out by the Judiciary Committee on February 22, but the leadership of the majority party, which has control of legislation, has not seen fit to permit it to be considered by the House.

In view of the fact that now in wartime it is being acknowledged that there is a scarcity of essential food; that there will in the coming year continue to be a scarcity, not only in butter and of meat, but a deficit of at least 25 percent in canned fruits and vegetables, is there any reason why this House should not immediately, certainly before recess, pass the Hobbs bill, send it over to the other body and insist that some action either in approval or disapproval be taken by that body on the proposed legislation? All too long after its attention had been called to the situation, this Congress has by its inaction permitted and tacitly given its approval to racketeering.

It would seem, too, that although the Federal law under the decision of the Court does not apply to such racketeering, Governor Dewey, the New York Legislature, and the Governors and legislatures of other States where the practice is followed should act to remedy the situation.

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY

**Mr. CANFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, according to Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, presi-

dent of Botany Worsted Mills, of Passaic, N. J., one of America's most forward-looking industrialists, the production capacity of the wool textile industry is being paralyzed by three restrictive measures—War Production Board Order M-388, Office of Price Administration Order MAP and the so-called army freeze.

When I returned recently from Europe I wrote Colonel Johnson asking for his reactions on WPB Order M-388, which had been the subject of an investigation by a House committee shortly before my departure abroad. Colonel Johnson speaks out plainly and frankly in the following letter which should have the serious attention of every Member of the House. Most certainly we do not want to see irreparable damage wrought this important segment of the American textile industry and its workers. Nor do we want the American people deprived of good clothing.

The colonel's letter:

BOTANY WORSTED MILLS,  
PASSAIC, N. J., June 2, 1945.

The Honorable GORDON CANFIELD,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.  
DEAR GORDON: Thanks for your wire regarding the present status of M-388. I had read in the local papers of your return from the trip to Germany, France, and England, which must have been a great experience from what you told me on the phone subsequent to your wire.

As I told you, the American public must be terribly confused as to what kind of an industry ours is, when, as a matter of fact, the entire textile industry and the wool group in particular has done an outstanding job of military and civilian production during the war period.

Army textile requirements give every evidence of being materially reduced during the third and fourth quarters of the year. The Navy has already cut back substantially and its future requirements will be less than in the past. While this is occurring, new and onerous restrictive orders of the WPB and the OPA threaten to reduce essential civilian wool textile production to a dangerous degree. I refer particularly to M-388 of the War Production Board, Maximum Average Price of the Office of Price Administration, and the existing freeze of the WPB on worsted and woolen yarn facilities.

We and others in the industry have strongly recommended to the WPB that the following steps be taken:

- (a) Rescind the existing freeze on woolen yarn;
- (b) Relax the freeze on worsted tops at least 30 percent;
- (c) Rescind M-388 at the mill level;
- (d) Rescind the quota percentage limiting the units of apparel items which may be manufactured under the provisions of M-388. Rescind also the maximum price limitations at which they may be manufactured.

I am certain that such a program would enable the wool textile industry to meet fully all present and future military needs and at the same time enormously increase production. Unless some such steps are taken, disastrous consequences must ensue in both the wool-textile and clothing industries. Both valuable production and tremendous employment capacity are already being lost.

Botany opposes both M-388 and MAP as unsound and unworkable. They try to force an industry to manufacture, sell, and distribute regardless of the traditional practices of the manufacturer, whether of fabrics or of garments. They disregard the machinery equipment of fabric manufacturers and the labor experience of garment manufacturers.

Their approach seems to be more definitely a desire to control and regiment than to supply either military or civilian requirements. They show a complete lack of comprehension of practical manufacturing and marketing and are destructive of the very things they aim to accomplish. We have consistently pointed out that operations will only be expanded in a market free from restrictions. We know there is a war on. We don't need to be scared; neither does the public. We are all prepared to meet any demands placed upon us, but we most decidedly resent being disorganized through bureau rulings.

The production capacity of the wool textile industry is being paralyzed by three restrictive measures:

1. M-388, and its component parts, which reduces the quantities and types of essential apparel items that may be made and fixes maximum prices for them. Manufacturers cannot make items they are not equipped to make no matter what the heavy thinkers of the bureaus may decide. Industry has turned, and continues to turn, itself inside out to take care of military requirements, but it will resist being forced into unsound business practices for theoretical needs for civilian markets, or for export. Americans cannot be forced to buy things they don't want. Manufacturers and distributors cannot risk their capital in hazardous inventory.

2. Maximum average price of OPA: This order, which is being issued piecemeal, endeavors to roll back time as well as prices. It is an absolute order covering textiles and clothing with no appeals for hardships or exceptions. Where M-388C makes it impossible for wool textile manufacturers to continue their traditional business, maximum average price makes it impossible for the textile manufacturers' customers to stay in business. Those who suffer most are those who held their prices at the lowest point during the applicable base period of 1943. Whatever the intent of maximum average price, its effect has been to create a chaos of uncertainty when increased production at fair prices is wanted.

3. Army freeze: The freeze on worsted and woolen yarn production now takes 90 percent of the production of the industry for military purposes. Both Army and Navy orders are diminishing, and will continue to diminish at an increased rate, as we enter the fourth quarter of the year. The only markets for the increased civilian yardage that will become available is in channelled markets of medium- and low-priced apparel items. Many mills cannot make the price fabrics required for these garments.

Garment manufacturers using worsteds for dresses are out entirely and manufacturers of men's suits are limited to 40 percent of the volume produced in 1943, if the fabric necessary is available—which it is not because of other sections of the controls. No business, however efficient, can survive on a 40-percent-production basis especially where prices are based on mass-production costs.

M-388 attempts to change the clothing habits of the country by prohibiting the manufacture of traditional garments such as sportswear, wool bathrobes, neckties, mufflers, caps, etc., apparently under the impression that these important items of apparel are superfluous. The conclusions of the WPB with reference to types of garments which are regarded as essential and statistics regarding the existing differences between supply and demand have been repeatedly proven to be incorrect. The wool textile industry, we, as an individual company, the clothing industry, and retail merchants of the country, have all urged that the WPB endeavor to obtain any needed quantities of essential garments by industry cooperation instead of attempting regimentation and coercion. Despite Nation-wide, industry-wide condemnation, M-388 still remains in effect and

each day of its existence it decreases the present ability of the wool textile industry to meet essential civilian requirements and threatens its future.

I stress this because I feel it is high time Congress either takes back some of the power granted these bureaus and their publicity departments or wipes them out. They are proving that they abuse rather than use the powers Congress has granted them. For many years I have had to go to Washington, and I have dealt with the then existent departments. I have always been listened to courteously and, where rules of the department were proven to be at variance with the law, the rules themselves were corrected. Chiefs of the departments or bureaus referred to themselves as public servants.

We seem to have developed a new type of bureaucrat. He resents what he calls interference with the Government's program and clothes himself with a holier than thou atmosphere that is presented to guard himself against criticism or suggestion. He has grown to such proportions that when Members of Congress ask him to testify or to discuss matters with them, he comes with a retinue of attorneys, paid for with taxpayers' money and allocated by Congress for war expenses. He answers questions by flouting you and telling you, "It's none of your business" or indicating that clear and frank answers interfere with the war effort.

Please understand that throughout our industry and at Botany we know there is a war on, as does practically every businessman in the country. All of us have been working weekdays, Sundays, and holidays for far more hours than we have any right to. We are proud to meet any military or essential civilian requirements which the war effort or our national welfare makes necessary. We want, and we know how, to meet our problems. The onerous and destructive burdens and restrictions of M-388 and MAP are making it impossible for us to do so. I have just returned to the mill at the urgent requests of my associates to discuss with them cancellations of Government orders. I find that production facilities which will be available cannot be properly used because the WPB and OPA orders and the freeze, ostensibly established to increase production, make it practically impossible for us to operate efficiently.

Cordially yours,

CHAS. F. H. JOHNSON,  
President.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DOMENGAUX (at the request of Mr. LARCADE), for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STOCKMAN (at the request of Mr. HOLMES of Washington), for June 4, 5, and 6, 1945, on account of official business.

To Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, for 10 days, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitations in certain cases.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, June 1, 1945, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1804. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the

Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942; and

H. R. 2600. An act to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, June 5, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., at which time testimony will be heard on H. R. 170.

##### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, June 5, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 2117.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, June 5, 1945, to resume and conclude public hearings on H. R. 3170, a bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports, and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities.

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Tuesday, June 5, 1945, 10 o'clock, a. m., in the Committee Room, 356 Old House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Patents on Wednesday, June 6, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., to continue hearings on H. R. 2630, a bill to provide for the public registering of patents available for licensing; H. R. 2631, a bill to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of the application; and H. R. 2632, a bill to require the recording of agreements relating to patents.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, beginning at 10 a. m., on Monday, June 11, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 2788) to amend title 28 of the Judicial Code in regard to the limitation of certain actions, and for other purposes. The hearing will be held in room 346, Old House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, June 12, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be resumed on H. R. 3235, a bill readjusting the rates of postage on books.



COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND  
NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an executive hearing at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, June 14, 1945, on H. R. 173, H. R. 1584, and H. R. 2256.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on Friday, June 15, 1945, beginning at 10 a. m., on the bills (H. R. 33 and H. R. 3338) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (referees—method of appointing, compensation, etc.). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

The Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings, to begin at 10 a. m., on Monday, June 18, 1945, on the following joint resolutions: House Joint Resolution 67, to declare the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to tide and submerged lands; and House Joint Resolution 118, House Joint Resolution 119, House Joint Resolution 122, House Joint Resolution 123, House Joint Resolution 124, House Joint Resolution 125, House Joint Resolution 128, House Joint Resolution 129, House Joint Resolution 130, House Joint Resolution 134, House Joint Resolution 137, House Joint Resolution 138, House Joint Resolution 146, House Joint Resolution 148, House Joint Resolution 153, House Joint Resolution 172, and House Joint Resolution 193, entitled "To quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles." The hearings will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

525. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$587,500, and a draft of a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

526. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$11,410,600 for the War Department, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 217); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

527. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of \$37,500, and for the fiscal year 1946, in the amount of \$46,000, in all, \$83,500, for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

528. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supple-

mental estimate for the Federal Security Agency for grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, and grants to States for unemployment compensation administration (H. Doc. No. 219); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

529. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States Naval Convalescent Hospital, Banning, Calif., on March 5, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

530. A letter from the executive assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revised estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, for the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

531. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 201 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC  
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 657. Report of the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 658. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 2860. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility to be constructed at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the Royal Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3370. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3371. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3372. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to prohibit reinduction of military personnel after release from the armed forces by reason of total service, overseas, combat, and parent-hood credits, as evaluated by the head of the department concerned; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3373. A bill authorizing the reconstruction of the Spring Common Bridge on Mahoning Avenue, across the Mahoning River in the municipality of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGEEHEE:

H. R. 3374. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel

for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in quonset hut No. 2, Hamoaze House, Plymouth, Devon, England, on December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3375. A bill to authorize domestic life insurance companies in the District of Columbia to make certain loans or investments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3376. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution establishing joint congressional committees to obtain complete information with respect to the functioning of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a special medal of honor to Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction and maintenance of the United States naval stations and fortifications on the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of part 1 of the hearings on postwar disposition of merchant vessels held before said committee during the current session; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 282. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and \$250 funeral expenses to Elizabeth Millard, wife of William C. Millard, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 283. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the progress report and prospectus of program for Smaller War Plants Corporation, entitled "Small Business Possibilities in Alaska"; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the new OPA regulations regarding the slaughtering of livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return the employment services to the States, not later than 90 days following the collapse of organized resistance in the European theater of war, or the proclamation of VE-day. Also, to include Alaska under the Federal Aid and Federal Highway Acts; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to enact legislation declaring the Indians within the State of New York, whether residing within or without any of the reservations within such State, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the State of New York in all respects excepting only those matters wherein jurisdiction has been or hereafter shall be expressly assumed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return the employment services to the several States at the earliest practicable moment, and specifically that the Texas State Employment Service be returned to the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income tax law so that it will not discriminate against 40 States, including Oklahoma, in favor of the 8 States having community-property laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS introduced a bill (H. R. 3378) for the relief of John A. Logan, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

839. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition by a group of citizens of Niagara County, urging passage of the Pace bill and closing taverns in the vicinity of Army camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

840. Also, petition by a group of citizens of Niagara County, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

841. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Edward French and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. Also, petition of Mr. O'Brien and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

843. Also, petition of Jeff Gazina and 33 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

844. Also, petition of A. Moll and 26 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

845. Also, petition of John Prince and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

846. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts to increase the subsistence allowances for war veterans while pursuing educational courses under the GI bill of rights, so-called; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

847. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to the establishment of a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

848. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of David M. Grant, Mildred Grant, and 295 other citizens of Missouri urging the passage of legislation enabling the tenants and occupants of

the Delmo Labor Homes to purchase these homes on long-term low-interest rates, so that these Missourians will not be evicted and rendered homeless under the Farm Security program, now pending, to liquidate this project by sale to the highest bidder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

849. Also, petition of Mr. Satterfield and 33 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

850. Also, petition of E. Helm and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

851. Also, petition of C. Meletis and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

852. Also, petition of Mr. Allen and 25 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

853. Also, petition of Mr. Roshel and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

854. Also, petition of Mr. Karros and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

855. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive board of the Gulf Coast Metal Trades District Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the allocation of some ships now waiting for repairs and conversion from the east and west coast to the shipyards along the Gulf coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

856. Also, petition of the chairman, Oswego Advisory Committee, Fort Ontario Shelter, Oswego, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the freedom of war refugees temporarily living at Fort Ontario, Oswego, N. Y., to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

857. Also, petition of the merchant crew, steamship *Willie Jones*, A. L. Burbank Co., care of postmaster, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2346; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we beseech Thee to be present and favorable unto these Thy servants, granting unto them grace and wisdom to meet the duties and responsibilities of their high calling with a loyal and steadfast devotion.

Help us to be faithful coworkers with Thee and with one another in ministering unto humanity's deep and bitter needs. May we be true, for there are those who trust us; may we be strong, for there are heavy burdens to carry; may we be brave, for there is much to do and dare.

We pray that the nations of the earth may be lifted into the loftier altitudes of

amity and peace. Grant that the ultimate victory for which we are struggling may be that glorious day when men everywhere shall yield themselves in a willing obedience to the King of kings and Lord of lords.

To Thy name we give the glory, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) entitled "An act for the relief of Continental Casualty Company, a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Incorporated."

CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO. AND MONTGOMERY CITY LINES, INC.

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 1307, an act for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the Senate amendments as follows: Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "to" over to and including "collision" on page 2, line 22, and insert "Montgomery City Lines, Incorporated, Montgomery, Alabama, the sum of \$266.49, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by it as the result of a collision involving one of its vehicles and a United States Army truck in the city of Montgomery, Alabama, on September 30, 1940."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Montgomery City Lines, Incorporated."

And agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,  
A. M. FERNANDEZ,  
W. A. PITTINGER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
ALEXANDER WILEY,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc., submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the House appropriated to Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, the sum of \$9,202.12, and appropriated to the Montgomery City Lines, Inc., the sum of \$266.49, for personal injuries and property damage sustained as the result of a collision between a bus operated by the Montgomery City Lines and a United States Army truck